Awareness of Multilinguality and the Resulting Cross-Linguistic Influence of English and Kiswahili on German

A Study of Multilingual Language Learning Awareness Among Kenyan Secondary School Learners of German as a foreign language

An der Philologischen Fakultät der Universität Leipzig
Eingereichte

DISSERTATION

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades
Doctor philosophiae
(Dr. phil.)

von

Rachel Muchira

GutachterInnen:

Prof. Dr. Claus Altmayer

Prof. Dr. Rose Marie Beck

Datum der Einreichung: 09.05.2019

Datum der Verleihung: 08.07.2019

ABSTRACT

This study is anchored on two premises: First, that due to cross-linguistic interaction resulting from the interconnectedness of the different language systems in the mind of the multilingual foreign language learner, cross-linguistic influence is inevitable, and, second, that if unmanaged, this interaction might lead to erroneous deviations in the language(s) of the learner. There are studies evidencing cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German amongst the Kenyan learners of this language. The question of the learners' awareness of this phenomenon, however, remains unanswered. In the framework of multilingual language learning awareness, and by use of an Untimed Grammaticality Judgement test consisting of grammatical errors in German arising from cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili, this study constructs explicit grammatical knowledge as an aspect of metalinguistic knowledge. It further assesses the learners' ability to apply this knowledge in the negotiation of the presented errors as evidence of awareness of cross-linguistic influence, with the ultimate aim of establishing what constitutes the learners' awareness of multilinguality and cross-linguistic influence of the dominant English and Kiswahili on German as a foreign language.

For my dear mum

Ruth Wangũi Mũchĩra.

For everything -

nĩwega mũno!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

They say it takes a village to bring up a child, and this sure has been the case with my PhD journey. I have so many to thank for walking this journey with me:

I am grateful to the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) for funding my research at the Leipzig University. The staff of section ST32 especially Mr. Michael Alexander Hillenblink - Thank you for your support. The DAAD Nairobi office, especially Ms. Anja Bengelstorff who helped me in the application process, ahsante!

My first supervisor, Prof. Dr. Claus Altmayer: Thank you for taking me up with my hazy ideas and allowing me to develop them into a study that I have enjoyed working on and have learned a lot on and from in the last years. Thank you for the probing questions and your guidance through the entire process.

My second supervisor, Prof. Dr. Rose Marie Beck: Thank you for letting me into your fold and giving me a second home in the Institute of African Studies, for all the discussions we had in our vibrant colloquium, the diverse readings, the dinners etc. Most of all, thank you for a listening ear and a safe space when the going teetered towards overwhelming.

The ’16 Form 3 German students of Starehe Boys’ Centre, Kaaga Girls’, Meru School, and Precious Blood Riruta: Thank you for being such willing and enthusiastic participants in my study.

The teachers who made this possible: Ms. Emma Osale (Kaaga Girls), Mr. Robert Mwangi & Ms. Faith Bett (Starehe Boys’ Centre), Mr. Nathan Kiprop (Meru School) and Ms. Nelius Kinyua (Precious Blood Riruta): Thank you for talking your students into participating in my study, for allowing me into your classrooms and for working with me during the night preps and weekends. Special gratitude to Ms. Osale for always coming through with the many technical and practice-oriented questions I had.

The absolute best *Kollegium* in the world, the Goethe-Institut Kenya teachers: Thank you for sharing your invaluable experiences in the development of my empirical tools, for the friendship and beyond-collegial support that makes our staffroom an amazing place and reminds me that I am a part of a great team even from this distance. And our BSO Irene Bibi: Thank you for being so accessible, for all the questions answered, for always having my back.

The participants of the Herder-Institut Forschungskolloquium, the Kulturwissenschaftliches Kolloquium, and the ESDL-colloquium: Thank you for the sessions and feedback that helped me learn and grow. I'm also grateful to the good souls in the African Studies Section: Irene Brunotti, Ari Awagana, Justus Chimoni, Monika Große, and Lara Krause. And to Susann Ludwig, heartfelt gratitude for always cheering me on.

My friends, who made this journey bearable and even fun! Eva Hamann, the very first person who listened to my ideas and read my drafts, then helped me find my way to Leipzig, Simone Willner, who helped me settle in quickly, Charlotte Steinke and James Orao for all the discussions, also for helping me with my data. Emma Ngare and Wilberforce Kutol for signing my bond, Rukiya Bakari for being a true friend, Paul Mwai and Njitts Carole Mwai for the Pampa send-off and the open arms and doors whenever I visited, Prof. Tomasz Milej for the professorial friendship and advice, Prof Stephan Mühr for reading and commenting on my draft, Prof. Nathan Ogechi for the administrative assistance, Prof. Kembo-Sure and Dr. Catherine Agoya for supporting my application.

And my loving family, whose unwavering love and support gives me courage me to fly, knowing that I always have a loving embrace to come home to: My mum's pure love and prayers and my dad who started called me "daktari" as soon as I expressed my desire to pursue a PhD. My ng'ano cia marimũ team - Joel, Joseph, and Carole, and the newest additions Wambũ, JJ, and Mr.T.: Thank you for anchoring me in love and laughter.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction

Learners of German in Kenyan secondary schools come equipped with multilingual knowledge whose benefits and drawbacks remain underexplored. This thesis aligns itself to the position that that the benefits of this knowledge in the learning of languages can be harnessed only if the learners are aware of the dynamism their multilinguality presents and acknowledge it as beneficial. The argument is that this awareness will enable the learners' ability to differentiate between the facilitative and inhibitive impact of the interaction of the various languages making up their multilingual systems on the learning process. This study, therefore, seeks to answer the question of what the Kenyan learners of German know about their being multilingual and how this plays out in their learning of German as a foreign language. It does so by exploring how the learners perceive their multilinguality and examining how they negotiate the error-causing cross-linguistic influence of Kiswahili and English on German. The objective is to establish an empirically founded overview of the status and nature of the existing linguistic knowledge that Kenyan learners bring with them into the German language-learning classroom, as well as their ability to apply this knowledge in dealing with errors that might arise due to the interaction of their languages. The outcome will highlight deficiencies in need for intervention so that the full benefits of the learners' multilinguality can be realized.

The Kenyan multiethnolingual setup means that already at the onset of learning German as a foreign language at the secondary school, the learners are multilingual; depending on where they grow up, they acquire one or more indigenous Kenyan language(s), and additionally learn Kiswahili and English from the first year of school (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012; Hinga, 2015). The Kenyan constellation of multilingualism is a complex one, offering no clear-cut distinctions of the language acquisition sequences amongst the learners. The general observation, however, is the presence of early and simultaneous

multilingualism (learners tend to acquire these languages at an early age and all together), as well as natural and formal multilingualism (in addition to acquiring English and Kiswahili informally - as they are the languages used for communication in public spaces and official settings, in the media etc., the two are also taught from the first year of schooling). It is therefore quite difficult to ascribe the linguistically applied terminologies of L1, L2, L3 etc. The multilinguality of the learners, however, remains undisputable.

An inevitable outcome of being multilingual is the cross-linguistic influence phenomenon, which refers to all transfer phenomena that result from the interaction of two or more language systems in an individual's multilingual system (cross-linguistic interaction) (Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Sharwood-Smith, 1989). For multilingual learners, awareness of the cross-linguistic influence phenomenon is crucial, as it will help them differentiate between the impeding and the promoting effects of cross-linguistic interactions on their target language. Findings of the previous studies on German as a foreign language in Kenya have established that the German of Kenya learners is marked with errors that can be traced back to the influence of English and Kiswahili (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012; Hinga, 2015). Building upon this, the present study investigates if and to what extent the Kenyan learners are aware of the error-causing cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German.

The premise of this study is that cross-linguistic interaction has potential benefits to the German language learning process, as it can be used to make connections that accelerate the leaning process. For this to happen, however, learners must be aware of this interaction, so as to control and use it to their advantage. It has already been argued that "(…) the possibility to establish cross-linguistic associations based on the similarities or differences between known languages is a powerful tool that can be turned to the learner's advantage 'if certain conditions are met'" (Bono, 2011, p. 26). This study posits that one such condition for Kenyan and other multilingual language learners is the raised awareness of the inevitable cross-linguistic interactions from their other languages.

As a basis for awareness-raising, there is need to establish what the learners know of the interaction of English and Kiswahili and their consequent influence on German, so that there is a clearer picture of where there is need for what kind of intervention. This study seeks to lay this groundwork, by establishing what the learners make of their multilinguality and its impact on German language due to the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili. These findings lay the foundation for further translation into concrete didactic approaches to the teaching and learning of foreign languages in Kenya and other multilingual contexts, and not only for German as a foreign language.

This study conceptualizes the awareness of one's multilinguality and the awareness of cross-linguistic influence as aspects of multilingual language learning awareness, thereby placing it in the larger context of Language Awareness. Language Awareness deals with the sensitization to the nature and form of language in its structure and use (detailed discussion in chapter 2). With the "multilingual" adjunct, this study foregrounds the learners' perception of their multilinguality as its principal object. By appending "learning", the study maintains its focus on what this awareness means for the learning of foreign languages by multilinguals in multilingual contexts.

This is especially relevant because multilingualism has been acknowledged as the norm in today's world, which has consequently led to the development of didactical approaches that take into account the multilinguality of (foreign) language learners. Some of these didactical concepts include the Tertiary Languages Didactics,[1] which proposes that all the languages that a learner knows should be integrated in the subsequent learning of languages (Hufeisen, 2000; Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998; Hufeisen, Neuner, & Europarat, 2004), there is also DaFnE (Deutsch nach Englisch = German L3 after English L2, third language acquisition/tertiary language learning)(Marx & Hufeisen, 2007, p. 308) and the EuroCom (European Comprehension) project, whose goal is to promote multilingualism and intercomprehension among the various languages present in the European continent. Under the EuroCom project, various programs have

[1] Tertiary languages refer to all the languages learnt after L2 (Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998)

been developed; EuroComRom for Romance languages, EuroComSlav for slavic languages and EuroComGerm ("Die Sieben Siebe" (Hufeisen & Marx, 2007)) for Germanic languages (Jessner, 2006, p. 132).

As was pointed out in the conceptualization of EuroComGerm, knowing a language does not automatically mean that one can easily and quickly understand another language, even if both languages are closely related; this is why the process of tapping into language resources must be learnt and practiced (Hufeisen & Marx, 2007, p. 6). The EuroComRom, EuroComSlav, and EuroComGerm clustered related languages and developed strategies and techniques aimed at teaching learners how to make connections between their languages and the foreign languages, thereby turning their knowledge of language into resources and bridges into new languages. Their approach largely involves training the learners to find similarities in the languages grouped together, and use these to infer meanings of words hence foster comprehension. In this, there is evident activation and enhancement of the learners' multilingual language learning awareness.

The relevance of the multilingual language learning awareness in the learning of German as a foreign language outside the European context cannot be emphasized enough. This awareness is definitive in whether or how the learner makes use of their existing linguistic knowledge as a resource. It stems from the acknowledgement that the learners' multilinguality forms an integral part of their German language learning process; it could be a facilitator, from which they draw and build upon to enhance the process, or an inhibitor, due to errors arising from cross-linguistic influence as their languages interact. While the two main studies on multilingualism and German as a foreign language in Kenya have established that Kenyan learners of German make errors in German that can be traced back to their languages, most notably English and Kiswahili, the question of how aware the learners are of this phenomenon remains unanswered. This question is what this study seeks to address, by taking these errors as manifestations of cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili, and assessing the learners' awareness of this phenomenon from the outcome of their

(the learners') engagement with these errors. The findings will guide the teachers in identifying where there is need for intervention, and what kind.

The referenced studies focused on deviations in the grammatical structures of the German language among Kenyan leaners (detailed discussion in 2.1.1.1.), due to the prominent role that grammar plays in the learning and assessment of German in Kenyan schools (See 1.4.2.). Consequently, explicit grammatical knowledge - not only of the target German language, but also of the English and Kiswahili- becomes relevant, seeing that they are the most actively involved languages in the learning process. This knowledge should guide the learners in drawing similarities and identifying the differences in the grammatical structures of the three languages. As such, a learner will be able to know where to fall back on the English and/or Kiswahili when confronted with similar grammatical phenomena in German on one hand, and to avoid pitfalls that would arise from the influence of the grammar of the two languages on German grammar.[2]

The question then, is how to gain access to what the Kenyan learners of German know about the intersection of the grammatical and explicit knowledge of these three languages. This is the awareness factor that requires learners to examine what they know (and/or don't know). The study therefore turns to metalinguistic knowledge and awareness, as its reflective approach allows more than just a simple comparison of the involved languages, but also allows a more detailed interrogation of the learners' sensitivity to how cross-linguistic influences impact their language learning:

> Metalinguistic dimension introduces a level of conceptualisation that allows researchers to go beyond the strictly structural analysis of the interactions between known language systems (L1, L2, L3…) to take into consideration issues of perceived language distance, cognitive flexibility, linguistic creativity, control mechanisms, communicative sensitivity and so on (Bono, 2011. p. 31).

[2] The descriptive taxonomy of errors arising from cross-linguistic influence contains four broad categories: Omission, addition (regularization, double marking, simple additions), misinformation (regularization, archi-forms, alternating forms), and misordering (See Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, p. 61)

The ultimate goal of this study is to establish what the Kenyan learners of German make of the interaction and influence of the multiple language systems present in their multilingual brains in the context of learning German as a foreign language. For this reason, metalinguistic knowledge and awareness is used to access and assess the learners' perception and knowledge, given that it has been argued that metalinguistic awareness among multilinguals should also encompass the tacit or explicit awareness of the interaction between languages in a multilingual's mind (Bono, 2011; Hofer, 2015, p. 123; Jessner, 2008, p. 279).

This study posits that due to the reflexive nature of metalinguistic knowledge and awareness, taking a metalinguistic dimension will enable access to the learners' awareness of the language interaction phenomena. This phenomenon is investigated at two levels, (1) being the awareness of the interacting language systems, and (2) the awareness of the resulting cross-linguistic influence, which causes errors in the German language. These two are singled out as important aspects of multilingual language learning awareness, and their investigation is guided by the following research questions:

i. How do Kenyan learners of German perceive their multilinguality and its impact on their learning of German as a foreign language?
ii. How do the Kenyan learners engage with grammatical errors in the German language arising from cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili?

1.2. Multilingualism, knowledge, and awareness in (foreign) language learning

As is evident in the previous section, this study threads together multilingualism, knowledge, and awareness in its conceptualization. The overarching prerequisite is that of multilingualism, which lays the ground for the development of the study. There is then the question of what this multilingualism means for language learners and the language learning, and herein lies the link to knowledge and awareness. The following section situates the study into these broad categories using the concepts of multilingualism and multilinguality,

explicit and implicit language learning and knowledge, metalinguistic knowledge and awareness as well as cross-linguistic influence.

1.2.1. Multilingualism and Multilinguality

Due to the different approaches (psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics etc.) taken to investigate multilingualism, different researchers have operationalized the term "multilingualism" to fit their specific studies (Kemp in Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009a, pp. 11–25; Cenoz, 2013). The underlying aspect in all these definitions, however, is the presence and use of multiple languages. One could begin from Mario Wandruszka's thesis in his book *Die Mehrsprachigkeit des Menschen*, which posits that every human grows up knowing multilingualism, since every language contains dialects, sociolects, registers etc. that every speaker encounters and learns to navigate from childhood. Therefore, even before encountering other languages that are different from their own, every individual is already aware that language exists in varieties (Wandruszka, 1979). As such, it is clear that multilingualism constitutes both an enabling environment and an individual, hence Cenoz's assertion that "Multilingualism is at the same time an individual and a social phenomenon. It can be considered as an ability of an individual, or it can refer to the use of languages in society" (Cenoz, 2013, p. 5).

This ushers in the concept of societal and individual multilingualism, with the former being described by the Council of Europe (2007, cit. in Cenoz, 2013) as "the presence in a geographical area, large or small, of more than one 'variety of language'. . . ; in such an area individuals may be monolingual, speaking only their own variety", while the latter -which is also referred to as plurilingualism - is defined as the "'repertoire of varieties of language which many individuals use' so that 'some individuals are monolingual and some are plurilingual'". It is therefore conceivable that there could be multilingual individuals in societies that are understood as predominantly monolingual, and vice versa.

"Individual multilingualism" has been used by Cenoz & Genesee (1998, p. 17) to refer to "an individual's acquisition of multilingual competence". Hoffmann and Ytsma in their elaboration introduce the term "multilinguality", and emphasize

on its immanent, manifold, and dynamic aspects in their definition:

> (…) [T]he inherent, intrinsic characteristic of the multilingual. (…) [A]n individual's store of languages at any level of proficiency, including partial competence and incomplete fluency, as well as metalinguistic awareness, learning strategies and opinions, preferences and passive or active knowledge on languages, language use and language learning/ acquisition (Hoffmann & Ytsma, 2004, pp. 17–18).

Tying multilinguality to personality has also been fronted by Aronin & Singleton (2012, p. 81) in their position that "it includes idiosyncrasies and peculiarities of communicators, legacies of historical events and family history, embedded assumptions and individual learning disabilities and gifts". They argue that:

> (…) each individual possesses his/her own multilinguality (…) It follows that language learning and use in a multilingual person involves the interaction of a wide and continually changing spectrum of influences including those arising from the mix of languages themselves – acquired at various stages and in various circumstances

Based on this, this study makes "the multilinguality of Kenyan learners of German" its subject, because its focus is on the learners who are multilingual, and not on the society in which the learners' languages are in use. The study however does not attempt to divorce the learner from his/her sociolinguistic environment, but rather acknowledges that the society's language use also influences the individual's linguistic repertoire, for example in shaping and defining their Dynamic Language Constellation[3] as well as their attitudes towards languages and their learning them. It therefore ties the Kenyan sociolinguistic setting to the theoretical framework and the empirical conceptualizations.

Following the postulation that "multilinguality is (also) about abilities and

[3] "For any individual the Dominant Language Constellation is the group of his/her most important languages that, functioning as an entire unit, enable him/her to act in a multilingual environment in such a way as to meet all of his/her needs" (Aronin & Singleton, 2012, p. 59). The study participants listed their mastered languages

resources" (Hoffmann & Ytsma, 2004, p.18), the present study focuses on how the learners perceive their individual multilingualism (multilinguality) as a potential resource in their learning of German as a foreign language. The investigation delimits multilingualism to English and Kiswahili due to the fact that these two are compulsory subjects in the Kenyan primary and secondary school levels and it has been established that learners have higher proficiency in them - compared to other indigenous Kenyan languages (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012). Consequently, it is conceivable that the learners have also developed grammatical and linguistic knowledge in the two languages, which provides a basis for a metalinguistic approach to the awareness of cross-linguistic influence. This calls for the explication of grammatical knowledge as explicit knowledge about language.

1.2.2. Explicit and Implicit language learning and knowledge

In her article *Explicit and Implicit judgment of L2 Grammaticality*, Bialystok (1979) makes reference to "formal explicit knowledge" and "intuitive implicit knowledge", thereby setting the stage for a differentiation of the two. By appending the adjectives "formal" and "intuitive", the idea of how this knowledge is developed and used by language learners is inferred; explicit knowledge is intentionally and methodically learned, while implicit knowledge is inherent, instinctive, and facile. The development of these language constructs are also tied to the teaching and learning approach taken: explicit knowledge is seen as the outcome of explicit/instructional learning, while implicit knowledge develops from implicit/incidental learning (Hulstijn, 2005, pp. 131–132).

Implicit knowledge develops when learners "automatically assimilate complex knowledge of syntactic and morphological structures" (Ellis, 1993, p. 290). This assimilation happens without the learners necessarily analysing the specificities of the structure and make-up of the language (form), rather by amplified aping of the productions of other speakers. Similar processes could be said to guide language acquisition among children or the informal non-instructional acquisition especially in multilingual communities like Kenya. The speakers of

the acquired languages, therefore, master and apply the conventions of the language, but they might not be able describe and/or explain them.

Language didactic approaches that take an implicit learning approach are characterized by reduced focus on grammatical rules. Learners are instead exposed to the input and are expected to learn how to make similar productions, by inferring how the various elements are used in specific contexts. Ellis illustrates that "[a] typical implicit learning task involves memorizing a set of sentences that have been constructed to exemplify a specific grammatical feature without being given any indication of what the feature is or even that the sentences illustrate a specific feature" (Ellis et al., 2009, p. 31). The repeated input should ensure that the structures get imprinted onto the learners' minds, similar to the naturalistic process of mastering a language; by the absorption of patterns observed in conversations (input). Language teaching methods such as the audio-lingual and communicative approaches were influenced by these implicit learning concepts

Explicit knowledge, on the other hand, is a product of explicit language learning, which is described as "input processing with the conscious intention to find out whether the input information contains regularities, and if so, to work out the concepts and rules with which these regularities can be captured" (Hulstijn, 2005, p. 131). Contrary to implicit learning, grammatical rules and concepts are directly referred to and highlighted in the teaching and learning process, which serves to provide the learners with "metalinguistic descriptions of the target features" (Ellis et al., 2009, p. 237). The outcome is knowledge that is based on rules and facts and is declarative in nature. Consequently - and additionally -, learners gain the structural and conceptual fundaments of their everyday language use. It is for this reason that explicit knowledge is also known as "knowledge about language" (Ellis, 2008, p. 2), which is conceptualised as one of the outcomes of language awareness (discussed on the next chapter). Ellis also made this connection in his definition of explicit knowledge as:

> [T]he declarative and often anomalous knowledge of the phonological, lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, and sociocritical features of an L2 together with the

> metalanguage for labelling this knowledge. It is held consciously and is learnable and verbalizable. It is typically accessed through controlled processing when L2 learners experience some kind of linguistic difficulty in the use of L2. Learners vary in the breadth and depth of their L2 explicit knowledge.[4] (Ellis, 2004, pp. 240–244).

There is general consensus that due to its intuitive, spontaneous, and automated nature, implicit knowledge should be the targeted outcome of learning a foreign language, since "[t]he ultimate, most highly prized goal of learning i.e., spontaneous, unreflecting language use is uncontroversial" (Sharwood-Smith, 1981, p. 159). This is because implicit knowledge is the kind tied to the languages skills involved in the everyday use of language (See also Ellis, 2008, p. 2), while explicit knowledge is "not available automatically in the automatic processes involved in the microgenesis of a sentence" (Paradis, 1994, p. 399).

What is still contentious, however, is how these two domains of knowledge relate to each other and how/whether they facilitate language development. In the case of first language acquisition, it is apparent that the development of implicit knowledge precedes that of explicit knowledge, as seen n the development of epilinguistic knowledge among children (Gombert, 1992; Karmiloff-Smith, 1979). In the case of foreign language learning - as with the learners of German as a foreign language in Kenya -, the question of the development of and relationship between of these two domains of knowledge is less clear. This has been discussed under the interface construct covered in these three main positions:

- Non-interface
- Weak interface
- Strong interface

1.2.2.1. The non-interface position

The non-interface position maintains that there is a clear separation between explicit and implicit knowledge. This separation is seen in the processes from

[4] This study expands "L2" to mean any language.

which the knowledge is posited to develop, with implicit knowledge issuing from subconscious language acquisition while explicit knowledge is said to be the product of conscious language learning (Krashen, 1981). The only possibility of convergence is when explicit knowledge playing a facilitative "monitor" role to improve accuracy in utterances, given that "formal knowledge of the second language, our conscious learning, may be used to alter the output of the acquired system, sometimes before and sometimes after the utterance is produced" (Krashen, 1981, p. 2)

Further reiteration of the distinctiveness of explicit and implicit knowledge is portrayed in the neurolinguistic stance that the two are served by different memory processes, since "explicit representations (in declarative metalinguistic memory) rarely- if ever- correspond to the implicit representations (in linguistic competence, available for automatic use)" (Paradis, 1994, p. 403). To reinforce his position, Paradis argues that:

> Practice does not convert explicit knowledge to implicit competence. The explicit knowledge is the knowledge of the rule, as it is enunciated (e.g., "make the past participle agree with the preceding direct object") […] "Practice" is not practice of the rule. (Practice of the rule, i.e., its repetition leads to the knowledge of the rule such that one can recall it on demand: "the past participle agrees with the preceding direct object", not the ability to make the agreement in the appropriate contexts".) (Paradis, 1994, pp. 403-404)

1.2.2.2. Weak interface position

The weak interface position postulates that explicit knowledge can facilitate the development of implicit knowledge so long as certain conditions are met. One such condition is that there is enough time to consult explicit knowledge during performance, as presented by the example of a learner taking time to refer to his/her explicit knowledge as well as other language resources in the exercise of letter writing, hence improving his/her accuracy, while a conversation in the target language would focus on fluency in lieu of accuracy (Bialystok, 1979, pp. 82-83). With continued consultation, the output units are adjusted to conform to the grammatical structures contained in the explicit knowledge. Explicit

knowledge in this case plays a controlling and regulating role, serving to fine-tune the implicit knowledge, seeing that "[d]eclarative rules can be used for conscious, attentive, usually slow regulation of output. Sufficient practice under such guidance can result in the [fine-] tuning of output modules (which themselves learn according to implicit associative principles)" (Ellis, 1994, p. 16).

Focus-on-form approach to language learning postulates that explicit reference to grammar supplements implicit (language) knowledge, since it has been observed that "[…] focus on meaning alone is insufficient to achieve full native-like competence, and that such a focus can be improved upon, in terms of rate of progress and ultimate attainment, by periodic attention to language as object" (Long, 2000, p. 179). This position is based upon the acknowledgement that there are aspects of the target language, where it might be too complex and or abstract for the learners to draw inferences from input without focusing their attention on the grammatical features. In such cases, presenting a grammatical rule greatly simplifies it and enhances comprehension. In this case, then explicit learning serves as an enabler for the development of implicit knowledge, as the two "work together in L2 acquisition and […] are dynamic, taking place consciously but transiently with enduring effects on implicit knowledge" (Ellis et al., 2009, p. 22).

1.2.2.3. Strong interface position

The strong interface position holds that explicit knowledge does not only develop into - but is in fact- a prerequisite for implicit knowledge. This position was especially pivotal in the criticism of the direct method and other naturalistic language didactic methods. It argued that language learners (especially mature ones) necessarily demand and require explicit grammatical explications, "since their intellectual maturity as well as their previous teaching/learning experience makes them cry out for explanations" (Sharwood-Smith, 1981, p. 160). Once the learners get the rules and structures explicitly explained, they are able to use them to practice their applicability at their own pace. The continued practice leads to spontaneity, as the rules get more entrenched into the learners' mind.

The same line of thought is continued in the Skill Acquisition Theory.

In his explanation of the *Skill Acquisition Theory*, DeKeyser infers that implicit knowledge is built on explicit knowledge, when he cites (Anderson, 1987, pp 204-205; Anderson & Fincham, 1994, p. 1223): "The crucial point is […] how one moves from exclusively declarative knowledge to at least partially procedural knowledge. […] proceduralization is achieved by engaging in the target behavior –or procedure- while temporarily leaning on declarative crutches" (DeKeyser in Doughty & Williams, 2009, pp. 42–63)[5]. In other words, explicit knowledge offers a good foundation (and/or is a prerequisite) for the development of implicit knowledge, which is understood to be the "ultimate goal of any [language] instructional program", as this is the knowledge that "underlies the ability to communicate fluently and confidently in an L2"(See. Ellis, 2005 p. 214).

By the foregoing, it is conceivable that the implicit knowledge of the German language among the Kenyan learners of German is built upon the explicit grammatical knowledge gained from formal instruction, their teachers, and the course books they use. This is given the foreign status of the language in Kenya, which means that the first and only contact the learners have with the language is in the classroom. This study's empirical findings (chapter 4) also emphasize the centrality of the formal instructions and grammar for this study's participants.

1.2.2.4. German as a foreign language in Kenya and the interface position

This study postulates a strong interface position for the learning of German as a foreign language in Kenyan secondary schools. This is informed by the fact that the Kenyan secondary school learners' first –and largely, only- encounters with the German language are restricted to the classroom allocation of optional subjects (3 lessons per week in forms one and two, 4 lessons per week in forms three and four)[6], and looking at the strong leanings towards explicit grammatical

[5] DeKeyser uses the terms explicit/implicit and declarative/ procedural are used synonymously, based on Anderson's position that "declarative knowledge is explicit while procedural knowledge is 'often implicit'" (1995, p. 308).
[6] A lesson is 40 minutes, meaning the learners had had approximately 260 hours of German at the point of data collection.

content in the lessons (see 1.4.2. below), then it is feasible that the development of the learners' implicit German language competencies are dependent on the grammatical knowledge taught in the classroom. It therefore follows that these learners' communicative proficiency in the German language depends on their mastery of the explicit grammatical content, and their ability to use it. Furthermore, there is empirical evidence in the learners' responses to the questionnaire; they admit that the (perceived) difficulty of the grammatical rules governing the German language makes them hesitant to use the German language in conversation (See 4.2.2.2., 4.4.).

This being the case, therefore, the question of the learners' mastery of the explicit grammatical content is a relevant one. Since this mastery determines their proficiency, then it follows that a learner who feels that they are making grammatical errors will be hesitant to use the German language, or avoid it altogether, which in turn denies them the chance to practice –hence- improve their skills; a never-ending loop that feeds into each other. This points to the need to take into account all possible error-causing factors so that targeted measures to empower the learners to overcome the errors can be developed (intervention).

Since it has been established that errors resulting from the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili are prevalent on the German of Kenyan learners, this study focuses on the learners' ability to make use of their explicit knowledge to tackle these errors, by engaging their metalinguistic reflections to analyze and control their grammatical knowledge. The outcome of this engagement will establish where their explicit grammatical knowledge is developed; hence the need for proceduralization and turn it into the implicit knowledge that is required for communication, e.g. by means of routinization and automatization (Ellis, 2015, p. 14)[7]. Where this knowledge is missing or under-developed, then interventional measures should be taken to draw the

[7] Ellis argues that "explicit memories can also guide the conscious building of novel linguistic utterances through process of analogy. Formulas, slot-and-frame patterns, drills, and declarative pedagogical grammar rules all contribute to the conscious creation of utterances whose subsequent usage promotes implicit learning and proceduralization" (2015, p. 14)

learners' attention to the phenomena as a first step towards proceduralization.

1.2.3. Metalinguistic knowledge and awareness

"Metalinguistic" generally refers to how individuals apply and use their knowledge about language(s) in their learning of other languages (Roehr & Gánem-Gutiérrez, 2015, p. 3). It involves "knowing about" as opposed to just "knowing" a language (De Angelis & Dewaele, 2011, pp. 25–52). Metalinguistics encompasses the ability to switch attention from language function to its form (Roberts, 2011, p. 48). Metalinguistic knowledge is "knowledge that is analysed, requires deliberate focus and learners know when they are drawing on it in for example making judgements about the grammaticality of sentences or edited writing" (Roehr & Gánem-Gutiérrez, 2015, pp. 71–94).

The above shows that metalinguistic knowledge –just like explicit knowledge and Language Awareness- involves taking language as subject matter in its own right, hence Gombert's position that "metalinguistics is concerned with linguistic activity which focuses on language" (Gombert, 1992, p. 2). In metalinguistics, linguistics meets psychology, with the former focusing on the verbal products (words) through which an analytic and reflexive use of language is manifested, while the latter focuses on the reflexive attitude and behaviour through which these verbal products are realized. This psycholinguistic approach makes it possible to:

> Analyze the behaviour, (verbal or otherwise) of the subject to discover elements that permit them to infer cognitive processes of conscious management (reflection on or intentional control over) of the language objects either as objects *per se* or in terms of the use to which they are put (Gombert, 1992, p. 4).

Consequently, it is commonplace to use the terms metalinguistic awareness, metalinguistic ability, metalinguistic behaviour, and metalinguistic attitudes, since these terms infer both the utterances (words/ verbal productions) and the psychological/cognitive elements that constitute metalinguistics (Gombert, 1992, p. 5).

1.2.3.1. Metalinguistic and epilinguistic knowledge

Distinction is also made between conscious and unconscious metalinguistic awareness, with the latter being referred to as epilinguistic awareness (Gombert, 1992; Wrembel, 2013). While metalinguistic awareness is characterized by its reflective, analytical and calculated traits, epilinguistic awareness is more intuitive. It is "unconscious, spontaneous and contextualised and can thus be exemplified by instances of self-repair in speech performance" (Wrembel, 2013, p. 120). Gombert (1992, p. 10) refers to it as linguistic intuition, possession of which is adequate for linguistic competence.

Epilinguistic knowledge enables speakers to identify and correct an error, but not be able to explain what makes the sentence or phrase ungrammatical. This knowledge (a language's rules and structures) that has been internalised, and that is unconsciously drawn upon to determine correctness. A speaker will thus say "She drive…, I mean, drives a train"; instinctively feeling that their construction is ungrammatical and correcting it, but if asked, they cannot explain what grammatical rule was flouted. A speaker with a developed metalinguistic knowledge and awareness, on the other hand, would be able explain that the third person singular requires that the verb stem takes an –s ending (reflect on and use their explicit grammatical knowledge of subject-verb agreement to explain). By doing so, they not only exhibit the knowledge of the rules, but also the status of knowing that they know, which is a marker of metalinguistic knowledge.

Another difference between metalinguistic and epilinguistic lies in the age at which each is developed, with epilinguistic knowledge being more manifest of (early) childhood language acquisition. This is largely due to the fact that metalinguistic knowledge requires more conscious application, which is not yet developed in small children. To elaborate this further, Ellis uses the illustration of children who acquire complex structures of their L1, and yet cannot explain these structures; he uses the example of the child who says that s/he does not know how to form the plural, but proceeds to (correctly) state that s/he has got

two wugs[8] (See. Ellis, 2008). The child has the intuitive epilinguistic knowledge of how to form the plural in English, but lacks the conscious metalinguistic knowledge, in that they do not know that s/he know how to form the plural. Metalinguistic knowledge, therefore, goes beyond just knowing, to include knowing that one knows. It encompasses the ability to reflect on what one knows and or does not know. It is for this reason that the term "conscious awareness" is sometimes used to describe metalinguistic knowledge (Gennaro, 1996, pp. 5–7; Roberts, 2011, pp. 13–16).

1.2.3.2. Metalinguistic knowledge and awareness as analysis of knowledge and control of processing

Metalinguistic knowledge and awareness is also constructed as comprising of two components: the analysis of linguistic knowledge and the control of linguistic processes (Bialystok, 1979, 1986, 1987, 1991, 1994). In her explication of the *analysis of linguistic knowledge*, Bialystok describes meaning-based mental linguistic representations as unanalysed, and "analysis" as the process by which they are transformed into analysed form-based mental representations (1994, p. 159). Meaning-based mental representations are tied to the communicative functions of language, while form-based representations are tied more to the structure and composition of language. The process of analysis entails looking beyond the message contained in a linguistic entity to its componential structure. It is, as Bialystok states, "[…] the skill component responsible for making explicit those representations that had previously been implicit or intuitive" (Bialystok, 1986, p. 499). This approach is similar to Cazden's (1975) definition of metalinguistic awareness as the "… the ability to make language forms opaque and attend to them in and of themselves" (cit. in Roberts, 2011, p. 1). It lays emphasis on the linguistic and grammatical forms of language as objects of study in their own right, similar to the concept of language

[8]"Wug" defined by dictionary.com as "a made-up word used in the so-called "wug test" to investigate the acquisition of the plural form in English-speaking children. Originated in the 1950s ('Wug-word dictionary definition | wug-word defined', 2018, Last accessed 03.07.2018 1457CET)

awareness, which is about rendering the implicit linguistic knowledge explicit (Bialystok, 1994, p. 159; Hawkins, 1984; James & Garrett, 1992).[9]

Depending on the situation, it might be necessary to focus on specific mental representations over the others. This calls for control of linguistic processes, which is the "ability to intentionally consider the aspects of a language relevant to the solution of a problem" (Bialystok, 1986, p. 499). Key to this process is the deliberate focus of attention, also referred to as "intentionality" (Bialystok, 1987, p. 156), which denotes conscious management of linguistic processes, similar to Gomberts's assertion highlighted above (in 1.2.3.). This skill is also tied to the ability to alternate between the various aspects of language[10] on an as-needed basis, highlighting some while supressing others depending on the task at hand. For bilingual (multilingual) learners, the control skill is crucial in the negotiation with habitually shifting formal linguistic representations with fixed meanings. The control of linguistic processing is regarded as more developed among multilinguals, because they are constantly engaged "in deciding between languages, attending to different phonological systems, and choosing the correct label for an object" (Bialystok, 1987, p. 156). This is of key interest for this study, since the question of how well the Kenyan learners of German are able to perceive the linguistic boundaries of the three languages (English, German and Kiswahili) by identifying where English and Kiswahili infringe on German causing errors is the focus of the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test.[11]

To work on the test, the learners must focus on the grammatical structures of German, English and Kiswahili, their parallels as well as divergences. This requires the application of explicit grammatical knowledge, which is the outcome of the metalinguistic awareness as analysis of linguistic knowledge. Moreover, the learners must also engage the control of their linguistic processes in the identification and explanation of the grammatical errors in the German language and make the cross-linguistic connection to the English and Kiswahili

[9] The concept of Language Awareness is discussed in detail in chapter 2
[10] "The ability to switch back and forth between forms and meanings, between graphemes and phonemes, between words and intentions, for example, is a crucial part of fluent reading (Lesgold and Perfitti, 1981 (cit. in Bialystok, 1987, p. 156)
[11] The development of the Untimed Grammaticality judgement Test is discussed in chapter 5

languages. This calls for a deliberate, reflective, and analytical approach to the tasks, as such embodied in the definition of Karmiloff-Smith et al: "Metalinguistic awareness involves conscious reflection on, analysis of, or intentional control over various aspects of language –phonology, semantics, morphosyntax, discourse, pragmatics- outside the normal unconscious process of production or comprehension" (1996, p. 198).

1.2.4. Cross-linguistic interaction and influence

The development of the empirical instrument mentioned above (Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test) was built upon the established presence of cross-linguistic influence of Kiswahili and English on the German of Kenyan learners (Agoya, 2012; Hinga, 2015). Cross-linguistic influence refers to the "influence of prior linguistic knowledge on the production, comprehension and development of a target language" (De Angelis, 2007, p. 19). In other words, it refers to the traces of the other languages that an individual knows on the language that is use. These traces can be present in any aspect of the language i.e. pragmatics and rhetoric, semantics, syntax, morphology, phonology, phonetics, and orthography subsystems of the language (Odlin, 2003, p. 437). The term was introduced in the eighties by Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman (1986) to describe "such phenomena as 'transfer', 'interference', 'avoidance', 'borrowing' and L2-related aspects of language loss" (Cenoz, Hufeisen, & Jessner, 2001, p. 1).

Among multilinguals, cross-linguistic influence involves all the languages making up the multilingual's language system, since it is an inevitable outcome of their interaction and interdependence.[12] Research has established that this influence is multidirectional, with not only the previously acquired languages influencing the newly learnt language, but also the new language system influencing the existing languages (Cheung, Stephen, & Tsang, 2011; V. Cook & Li, 2016; Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Pavlenko & Scott, 2002).

Given the inevitability of cross-linguistic influence, it is important that learners are aware of it and the effect it has on their languages and language learning

[12] Discussed in detail in chapter 2

process. This is referred to as cross-linguistic awareness (James, 1996), and it is what this study investigates among Kenyan learners of German. Within the construct of multilingual language learning awareness, (which is discussed in detail in chapter 2), the study seeks to establish how the learners in their reflections construct their awareness of multilinguality and cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German; what it entails and how it is manifested in their engagement with items presented in the empirical instruments.

This study concedes that the Kenyan sociolinguistic landscape influences the multilinguality of Kenyan learners of German, and consequently their awareness of the same in respect to their German language learning experience. The following section, therefore looks at how factors like language policy, the constellation of languages, as well as the curricular regulations in the learning of German as foreign language in Kenyan secondary schools shape the learners' perception of their multilinguaity and its role in foreign language learning.

1.3. The Kenyan multilingual setting as the backdrop for learning German as a foreign language

This section places the learning of German as foreign language in the Kenyan multilingual context, by looking at how multilingualism is and has shaped the language policies and practices in Kenya, and how these policies and practices lay the groundwork for the learning of foreign languages, in this case German. In looking at the Kenyan sociolinguistic field as the setting for learning German as a foreign language, the study acknowledges that its complete setup; including its languages, language policies and planning, language practices, language teaching and learning approaches etc. contribute to the proficiencies and competencies in, attitudes towards, and perceptions of language(s) of the learners of German as a foreign language, which all go towards the development of their multilingual language learning awareness.

1.3.1. On the Kenyan sociolinguistic situation

The Kenyan sociolinguistic situation has been the subject of many studies, and its

multiethnolingual characterization has found consensus amongst scholars and researchers, who have used this as the basis for the discussion of various linguistic issues in the Kenyan setting. The question of the number of Kenyan indigenous languages is still not clear, especially due to the fact that a number of these languages still remain unstandardized, also due to the hazy line between language and dialect in some cases. Ethnologue lists the number of individual languages in Kenya at 67, with English and Kiswahili as the official languages ('Kenya', n.d.). This makes for a dynamic linguistic space.

1.3.2. Language policy, planning and education in Kenya

Issues of language policy and planning in pre-independent and post-independence Kenya and how these have shaped (and keep shaping) language learning and use in Kenya have been discussed in amongst others, (Kembo-Sure & Ogechi, 2006; Mbithi, 2014; Nabea, 2009; Oduor, 2010, 2015). Central to these studies is the question of how Kenyan indigenous languages[13] have fared in the face of these policies. The general position is that the Kenyan indigenous languages have been continually disadvantaged due to the disconnect between policy and practice. This in turn impacts on how the indigenous languages are handled in schools, as well as the perceptions of their speakers towards them.

The crux of the matter is in the implementation of the policies, which exposes the discrepancy between policy and practice; an instance being the failure to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya 1999 (Koech Commission),[14] which the Ministry of Education declared unimplementable, citing "cost, structural, and institutional limitations" (Njoroge & Gatambuki Gathigia, 2017). The subsequent Taskforce on the Realignment of the Education Sector to the Constitution of Kenya of 2012 (The Odhiambo Taskforce) took the same stance towards language as the Koech

[13] Kenyan indigenous languages refer to all other languages and dialects –apart from English, Kiswahili and those classified as foreign languages (German, French, Spanish etc.) present in the Kenyan sociolinguistic space.

[14] The Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya of 199 (Populary known as "The Koech Commission) recommended that the learners' mother tongue or the dominant language of the schools' catchment areas be used as the medium of instruction while Kiswahili is used in urban centres due to the heterogeneous linguistic composition of the population (Njoroge & Gatambuki Gathigia, 2017, p. 79).

Commission. This commission was set up following the promulgation of the Kenyan Constitution in 2010, in which the multiethnolinguistic nature of the Kenyan society is acknowledged, as spelled out in Chapter 2 Article 7 (3) of (*The Constitution of Kenya*, 2010):

> The State shall–
>
> (a) promote and protect the diversity of languages of the people of Kenya; and
>
> (b) promote the development and use of indigenous languages, Kenyan Sign language, Braille and other communication formats and technologies accessible to persons with disabilities.

At a first glance, it would seem like the language policy is Kenya is very progressive. However as (Oduor, 2015, p. 3) posits, this progressiveness is "on paper only", given that in practice, indigenous languages are locked out of the formal education setting, mostly due to the prevailing beliefs on and prejudices against indigenous languages shared by parents, teachers and extended also to the learners, as Wangia et.al. (cit. in Njoroge & Gatambuki Gathigia, 2017, p. 80) observe:

> In most rural areas in Kenya, (…) despite then elaborate recommendations of previous education commissions in Kenya and the guiding language policy, children still enter school and face a foreign language being used as a medium of instruction.

An official of Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) in her statement confirmed this unfortunate state of affairs:

> *(…) Unfortunately the language policy is not implemented as stated. The notion that English is superior has taken over so that it is pushed down their [the children's]throats even when they can't speak a single word. That is why many kids especially whose L1 is their local language cant read. In the new curriculum, indigenous languages will be offered as optional subjects as from Grade 4. We*

intend to work with county governments to push this forward especially languages without orthographies.[15]

Kembo-Sure in his inaugural Lecture at the Moi University (Kembo-Sure, 2013), uses the Kenyan multilingual setting to link literacy, language and liberty, placing the use of English as the official language in the countries where it is not native in the centre of his discussion. He uses the examples of Kenya, Tanzania and Ethiopia to highlight "failed language policies" (p. 42), which have in turn led to a blatant denial of literacy rights, as manifested by the falling educational standards in Kenya, (p. 50) and the continued dismal performance of the affected learners in the national examinations, which consequently drastically affects their chances of pursuing higher education (p. 52). He cites the findings of Ackers, Migoli & Nzomo (2006, p. 36) in reference to the Kenya National Primary Baseline Project of 1998, which determined that the "[t]eaching styles for the three core subjects of Math, English and Science were very similar, being dominated by transmission forms[16] of teaching with no interactional space for pupils" (p. 50).

If interaction is not facilitated and/or encouraged, then it means that learners have no chance to reflect on and shape their own learning interests. This raises the question of the effectiveness of the entrenched language teaching approaches, and how/whether they prepare the learners for the learning of further (foreign) languages. The main question therefore is whether the learners who go through this didactical approach are able to develop language and language learning competencies, skills and strategies that can be built upon to enable the implementation of (modern) language teaching methods like those mentioned in the introduction (1.1), which are seen to work in the multilingual Europe?

[15] Excerpt from WhatsApp exchanges on 17.11.2017, copied as is.
[16] According to Pratt (2002), Transmission forms of teaching view the "(...) learner as a 'container' to be filled with something (knowledge). This knowledge exists outside the learner, usually within the text or in the teacher. Teachers are to efficiently and effectively pass along (teach) a common body of knowledge and way of thinking similar to what is in the text or the teacher.'' Pratt continues: "These teachers (are) primarily focused on the content rather than the learners."(P. 8).

1.3.3. The hegemony of English: Multilingualism, the valuation of languages, and identity

Githiora (in Simpson, 2008, pp. 235–251) discusses the role of multilingualism in the Kenya(n)s' "search for cohesion, unity and a collective identity as a modern nation" (pp. 235). He traces this search from the colonial times when the British colonialists' occupation lead to the establishment of English as the language of power, and the consequent rise of Kiswahili as the language of Africans' solidarity in the fight against colonialism (pp. 240-241). He argues that (Ki)Swahili has gained its rightful place as the "national language" of Kenya, noting that:

> Swahili is favoured as the best unifier for the nation because it is an African language that is easily accepted by Kenyans of all ethnic and regional backgrounds as the national language, (…) who regard it a 'neutral' language devoid of connotations of power, or political or economic denomination (pp. 250)

And continues:

> It is also an African language of international recognition and diffusion and has a body of literature and scholarship in which Kenyans take pride. (pp.251).

But even while Kiswahili is regarded as the vehicular language and has even been ratified as the National language such under Chapter 2 Article 7 of the Kenyan constitution (The Constitution of Kenya, 2010), the reality of this status does not translate to its rise in prestige amongst its speakers and users. Language Policies since pre-independent Kenya have contributed to the development of triglossic situation that has the superiority of English firmly entrenched in the Kenyan linguistic field (See also Mkilifi, 1972, p. 197). As Githiora puts it:

> (…) [T]he retention of colonial structures that favour a linguistic hierarchy with English at the top and Kenyan languages at the bottom. A deeply entrenched "psychic disbelief" in African languages, [which] limits their potential in areas of formal communication, knowledge production and art (pp. 250)

This is also seen in how Kiswahili and other indigenous languages are handled in then school setting, for example, as illustrated by Muaka (2011) in his study on *Language perceptions and identity amongst Kenyan speakers*, in which he states that "teachers emphasize knowledge of English over all other languages" (p. 225), and proceeds to explain how students are even punished for using any other language within the school grounds.[17]

That the learners' other languages have no place in schools is a matter of concern for this study, seeing that it seeks to find a nexus between the multilinguality – not only knowledge of and proficiency in English- of Kenyan learners of German as a foreign language, their awareness of this multilinguality, and the role it plays in their learning of German as a foreign language. This is especially relevant within the framework of the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism, which speaks for a holistic approach and understanding of a multilingual's linguistic system, and is further discussed in section 2.8.

Although Kiswahili tends to have a higher standing compared to other indigenous languages (See Muaka, 2011, p. 226), it is still not at par with English. Proficiency English is still seen as a status marker; that of belonging to a higher social-economic class. The media also propagates this notion, with some Kenyan-produced television programs using language as a marker for socioeconomic class distinctions; the economic elite use English while the others use Kiswahili and/or sheng.[18] As a result, it is not uncommon to hear people (proudly) profess their non-proficiency of Kiswahili (and other Kenyan languages), since by doing so, they are marking themselves as belonging to belonging to the class of the elite that moves in circles where English functions as a "code which symbolizes modernism and elitism" (Kachru (1992 p. 58) cit. in Michieka, 2005, p. 181).

---

[17] See also Ngũgi wa Thiong'o's account on the consequences if one was found speaking Gīkūyū in school; "corporal punishment which included caning on the bare buttocks, or carrying a heavy metal plate with the inscriptions I AM STUPID or I AM A DONKEY" (Wa Thiong'o, 2005, p. 11)

[18] An example for this is MALI, described as Kenyan a TV-Series and Soap opera produced by Al Is On productions. It ran from 2011 to 2015, and followed the lives of a wealthy family after the patriarch dies without living the will. The linguistic interplay showcases the select codes for the different classes present in the show; with the upper class using English while the others use Kiswahili and/ or sheng, sometimes even with each other, e.g. The employer addresses an employee in English, who then responds in Kiswahili.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mali_(TV_series) (Last access: 27.11.2017 1850Hrs CET)
http://www.imdb.com/title/tt4184438/ (Last access: 27.11.2017 1904Hrs CET)

The elitism of English gets entrenched into the learners right from their entry into the formal school system, if not earlier, by parents who in their understanding of language economics see English as a resource.[19] These parents see their children's proficiency in English as a direct investment into their accessing the job markets (See Oduor, 2010, p. 98). In other words, it is better to be (seen as) weaker or poorer in Kiswahili and other Kenyan languages, than in English. It is therefore not surprising, that in the present study, more of the respondents rated their speaking, writing, reading and listening skills in English as better than in Kiswahili, as shown in the table below:

Skill	English	Kiswahili
Speaking	59%	38%
Writing	43.5%	36%
Reading	85%	72%
Listening	77%	66%

Table 1 Percentage of respondents Percentage of learners who rated their skills in English and Kiswahili as "very good"

In addition to this self-evaluation, it is only in Kiswahili where learners willingly announce their low proficiency:[20]

KG11: *I am not so good in Kiswahili.*

PG1: *My Kiswahili isn't that good […].*

Given the linguistic background in which the respondents find themselves, the question of whether and/or to what extent this self-evaluation is a true reflection of the respondents' competence, or a perception of what their competence should be, becomes relevant. Are the learners really more proficient in English, or do they prefer to (be viewed) as better speakers/writers/readers/listeners of English than of Kiswahili? There is not one single instance where a respondent marked their competence level in Kiswahili higher than in English, while the

[19] In defining "language economics", Coulmas, 1992 cit. in (Kamwangamalu, 2010, p. 12) "Within the framework of language economics, linguistic products such as language, language varieties, utterances, and accents are seen as goods or commodities to which the market assigns a value. The term "market" refers to the social context in which linguistic products are used.

[20] In response to the question if the knowledge of Kiswahili helps in the learning of German.

reverse was quite common. Muaka (2011) argues that the school plays a crucial role in shaping a learner's linguistic identity. In his words:

> In the Kenyan situation, students (…) are convinced from the onset that in order for them to succeed, they have to abandon using their local languages and instead focus on speaking and writing English as the only window to success (p. 226)

It is in these schools where such beliefs and attitudes towards languages prevail that learners encounter German as a foreign language. The German language is taught and learned against the background of disregarded and side-lined mother tongues/L1s, which makes the implementation of teaching and learning methods that work in other multilingual settings, a challenge, but one that need to be tackled head on. The social and political domains of language awareness[21] are absolute necessities in this setting.

1.3.4. The "Kizungu kilikuja kwa meli" movement: Pushing back against the English hegemony

While the discussion above paints a bleak picture of the state and fate of Kenyan indigenous languages, there is growing resistance against the supremacy of English, especially when it is at the cost of subjugating the indigenous Kenyan languages. This is evidenced in that increasingly many Kenyans are embracing the traces of cross-linguistic influence on English as a symbol of pride for being well anchored in one's language and culture.

This line of thought is not entirely new; Ngugi wa Thiong'o in his essay "Decolonising the mind – The politics of language in African literature" called for the empowerment of indigenous African languages, arguing that language is tied to a people's identity because it is not only a means by which they communicate, but also because it transmits their culture across the generations (Wa Thiong'o, 1986). Consequently, being able to use (especially speak) the language of the ethnic community one is born into was viewed as a requirement and part and

[21] Discussed in chapter 2.

parcel of belonging to this community, hence the rise of the term "mkosa kabila",[22] as a derogatory reference to people who could not speak their indigenous languages (See also Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, p. 49; Oyango, 2011). With time, however, intermarriages across the different communities became common, and rapid urbanisation brought with it Kiswahili as the language of urban settlements and consequently the first language of children growing up in these places. It therefore became evident that clear-cut demarcations along ethnolinguistic lines are no longer valid, and the term "mkosa kabila" lost its power, and the place of Kiswahili as the language of Kenya(ns) was entrenched.

In what could be seen as a move towards challenging the hegemony of English, the practice of shaming and ridiculing those who cannot speak a Kenyan indigenous language and/or Kiswahili continues. This was more recently witnessed by Kenyans' criticism of the president's son's inability to express himself in Kiswahili at a public function. Newspapers reported that: "Kenyans were dismayed, calling him unpatriotic for not being able to deliver a simple message in the native language" (Muli, 2017). They also postulated that his political aspirations are thwarted by his lack of fluency in Kiswahili, because this is the language of the voters. That Kiswahili is referred to as "native" shows the value of Kiswahili to Kenyans, who regard it as their own, even equating knowledge of it to patriotism.

With the continued elevation of Kiswahili comes the resistance to the superiority of English, as seen in rebuttals like "kizungu kilikuja kwa meli" when one's error in the English language is pointed out. This saying, which literally translates to "English came by ship", embodies the perception of English as foreign among these Kenyans, who then feel no obligation to speak it perfectly. This and other similar terms are used to silence those who attempt to shame others for making errors in English or exhibiting cross-linguistic influence of their indigenous languages on English. English is, after all, not their own, and so instead of struggling to abide by its grammatical conventions, they adapt it to fit their functional context. This is in line with the assertion that Kenyans engage in

[22] Literal translation: one without a tribe.

appropriation, abrogation, and the creation of new patois as ways of challenging the hegemony of English (Nabea, 2009). Other consequences of this stance as well as their impact for the learning of German as a foreign language in Kenyan are discussed under the Kenyan-specific sociolinguistic factors that were taken into account in the development of the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test research instrument (5.1.3).

1.4. German as a foreign language in Kenyan secondary schools

According to the records of the Goethe-Institut Kenya, the German language is taught in approximately 100 secondary schools that follow the Kenyan curriculum.[23] As an optional subject, it means that learners choose to learn it, unlike compulsory language subjects like English and Kiswahili. Opting to learn a foreign language is a conscious choice to add to an individual's linguistic repertoire, which counts towards his/her linguistic identity. As William (1994, p. 77) cit. in (Dörnyei, 1998, p. 122) puts it:

> There is no question that learning a foreign language is different to learning other subjects. This is mainly because of the social nature of such a venture. Language, after all, belongs to a person's whole social being: it is part of one's identity, and is used to convey this identity to other people. The learning of a foreign language involves far more than simply learning skills, or a system of rules, or a grammar; it involves an alteration in self-image, the adoption of new social and cultural behaviours and ways of being, and therefore has a significant impact on the social nature of the learner.

In line with the current curriculum, the subject "German" (and other foreign languages) is introduced in the first year of secondary school.[24] The learners involved in this study were in the third term of their third year of secondary

[23] Out of the 5,013 registered public secondary schools as per open data source stand at 04.02.2019 (*Kenyan Public Schools*, 2019) *opendata.socrata.com/api/views/pvyx-e6iv/rows.pdf* (Accessed 06.04.2018 0657 CET)

[24] Kenya currently follows the 8-4-4-school system, in which learners spend 8 years in primary school, 4 years in secondary school and 4 years in the university (for a Bachelor's degree, apart from courses in medicine and engineering). The Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) is however in the process of implementing a curriculum reform ('Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD)', n.d.).

education (form three), and had had a chance to make their final subject choice for the National Exam; [25] this means that these learners had made the decision to continue learning German even after being presented with the opportunity to discontinue. Their decision makes it worthwhile to look into their motivation.

1.4.1. Learners' motivation for learning the German language

The above-discussed Kenyan education system's attitudes towards languages seems to have had an impact even in the learners' decision to learn foreign languages, whereby some learners tend to look at these purely in terms of investment towards the future. When asked about their decision to learn German in secondary school, -seeing that it is an optional subject, a number of this study's respondents gave professional and career perspectives that include "study in Germany" and "work in Germany" as their main motivation for choosing to learn German as a foreign language.

Psychology studies do not see this type of motivation as very effective in promoting language learning, as it does not enhance the learning process and experience, by " […] instilling an appreciation for creativity and satisfying some of the more basic drives for knowledge and exploration […]", but rather, "focuses students too exclusively on the material or monetary rewards of an education […]" (see also Brown, 1994,p.40 cit. in. Dörnyei, 1998, p. 124). There are however learners whose reasons for learning German as a foreign language align to the affective/integrative as well as significant other dimensions of motivation (Dörnyei, 1998, p. 128), as illustrated:

i. The Affective/integrative dimension encompassing the emotions associated with learning German as a foreign language, e.g.
    - KG1: *I find it fun to be able to speak, write and reading German. For me, it dilutes the other a bit tough subjects and I relay my mind.*

[25] In the current Kenyan secondary school system, learners are expected to select the subjects they will take in the final National Examination (KCSE) at the end of Form 2 (second year). The final National examination –which also serves as the university entrance exam- is done at the end of Form 4 (fourth year).

- PG5: *I have always had an interest in languages and cultures foreign in nature, plus positive influence from my sister*
- KG9: *My motivation is that I like learning many languages and being exposed to the world and learning many things about other countries*

The Affective/integrative dimension also involves language attitudes. In the case of these learners, their affinity to the German language lies in its positioning in the society. This is due to the fact that the foreign languages offered in Kenyan secondary schools are classified as "prestige languages", since (1) only a few select schools offer them, and (2) the learners taking these subjects are also carefully chosen (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, p. 79). The learners see that their proficiency in the German language will allow them to belong to this small exclusive group of German speakers in Kenya:

- SB7: *My motivation for learning German is to be a person who can stand out among many and be unique and hope to get exposed to German culture someday*
- PG8: *The fact that I will have knowledge on more languages compared to my other counterparts. I have an upperhand […]*

ii. Significant others-related dimensions, whereby people whose opinion the learners hold valuable influence their study choices e.g. parents, family, friends:

- KG11: *The fact that no one in my family has tried learning any foreign language gives me the motivation to do my best in German, no matter how many times I will pass or fail in it, so that they too can get challenged to learn if not all at least on language*
- PG6*: I have a sister who did German in high school. She got an A and that gave me the motivation to learn German*

All these responses are testament to the Kenyan learners' of German willingness and desire to develop a mastery of the German language. This reaffirms the need to identify all possible impediments to the learners' ultimate goal, so as to

develop appropriate solutions. Learners' multilingualism and multilinguality has been identified as a possible stumbling block in second and foreign language acquisition and learning, due to instances of (negative) transfer and interference resulting from cross-linguistic influence (Corder, 1975; Gass & Selinker, 1994; Odlin, 1989). Ascertaining what and how much these learners know of the cross-linguistic influence phenomenon lays the groundwork to empowering them to deal with it, which will take them a step further towards achieving their goals of learning German as a foreign language.

1.4.2. The German lesson in the Kenyan Secondary School

As established, German in Kenyan secondary schools is taught and learnt as part of the secondary school curriculum, and in preparation for the National Examination KCSE. The National exam being also the university entrance exam, it is understandable that performance is key.

Section 1 of KCSE German Paper 2 (502.2) focuses on grammar and contains questions like "complete the following sentences using the comparative or superlative form of an appropriate adjective and write the sentences in the imperative mode".[26] This question requires the explicit knowledge of grammar to answer, and serves as an illustration of the centrality of grammar in the learning of German as foreign language in Kenyan secondary schools. The many Continued Assessment Tests administered in the course of the school terms and years are also largely grammar tests, hence the form-focused approach in the teaching of German as a foreign language.

Form-focused instruction is defined by Weskamp as teaching and learning activities in the classroom that are aimed at drawing the learners' attention to the phonological, lexical, grammatical as well as pragmalinguistic aspects of language (Weskamp, 2007, p. 109).[27] The target language is broken down into bits and entities and presented in the course books, and the teacher guides the learners into mastering an aspect of the target language.

[26] 2015, KCSE German Paper 2
[27] German original, translation by author

As Ellis puts it,

> Focus-on-forms implies that the teacher and students are aware that the primary purpose of the activity is to learn a preselected form and that learners are required to focus their attention on some specific form intensively in order to learn it (Ellis, 2001, p. 17).

The same has been echoed by Roehr-Brackin (2018, pp. 90-91), and is seen in the way the course books used in the Kenyan secondary schools are structured; in such a way that the grammatical phenomena to be learned are well enunciated in different chapters and sections.[28] As such, it is clear to both the teachers and the learners that Section D of chapter 7 in the course book Safari Deutsch 1 covers the "Imperativ (‚Sie' und ‚ihr' Formen)".

The learners' responses to the questionnaire also point to a form-focused approach with the teacher and the rules of grammar at its core; there is evident threading of teacher input, grammar and (grammatical) rules as the most significant factors in their learning of German:

- KG12: *Once the teacher has taught a concept in class, I always try to remind myself. Also I use revision books like Klipp und Klar*[29] *to go through what we have been taught*
- MB4: *Listening and following my teacher's instructions. Regular revision of every value added in each German lesson*
- SB10: *Practicing German regularly so that I am versed with the rules of the language as well as improving my vocabulary and speech*
- PG4: *I learn German best by speaking and listening. This enhances my sentence construction as well as helps me in applying the German language rules*

By the foregoing, it is clear that the learners are expected to have a basic understanding of the linguistic and grammatical categories and terminology, as

[28] Kenyan secondary schools are currently using the Kenya Institute of Education published books(Kenya Institute of Education, 2009a, 2009b, 2011)
[29] "Klipp und Klar" is a series of German grammar workbooks (A1-C1) published by the Ernst Klett Verlag based in Stuttgart, Germany.

the teaching and learning of the German language is built upon this knowledge. Already at the very beginning (in Section A of Chapter 1 of the course book Safari I used in the first year of learning German in Secondary school (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009a, p. 17), the instructions read: "Ergänze die Personalpronomen" (fill in the personal pronouns), spelling trouble for the learners who might not know what a personal pronoun is. At the end of chapter 1 (P. 30-31), a list of words classified as "verbs", "nouns", "adjectives", and "function words" is presented without further explanation of what these words are. This means that it is expected that the students are already familiar with these terminologies, and know their place and function in language.

1.4.3. Multilingualism in the Kenyan German language classroom

German in Kenyan is taught and learned in the context of classic retrospective-prospective multilingualism,[30] where the secondary school learners are already multilingual at the onset of their learning of German as a foreign language; most have an L1 that is an indigenous Kenyan language, and all of them by virtue of having gone through eight years of primary school have learned and acquired English and Kiswahili (See: Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012; Hinga, 2015; Muchira 2018).

In the eight years of learning English and Kiswahili in primary school, the learners gather experiences and also develop skills and strategies to improve their language learning and acquisition. These are resources that can be made use of to improve the German language learning process, as suggested by approaches in foreign languages didactics like the tertiary language didactics, DaFnE, etc. These approaches encourage (foreign) language learning by building upon then previously acquired language knowledge and learning experiences, with the aim of optimising and economising the learning process.

Previous studies in learning German as a foreign language in Kenya, however, acknowledge the challenge of embracing multilingualism in the Kenyan German

[30] Königs, 2000 cit. in (Hufeisen, Neuner, & Europarat, 2004, p. 15) defines retrospective-prospective multilingualism as a situation in which "a learner brings his/her plurilingualism into the classroom and therefore has a substantial lead in linguistic knowledge over the other learners, but neither of these two languages is the subject being taught. Through teaching in an L3 (or Ln) the learner is extending his/her plurilingualism.

lesson. Agoya-Wotsuna, (2012) makes the observation that the Kenyan German language still adheres to the direct method of language teaching, in which only the German language has place in the lesson (p. 291). She also points out the challenge of the teachers' insufficiency, in that it would be impossible for a teacher to possess proficiency in all the languages that could be represented in a classroom (p. 297). Looking at the Bachelor of Education Arts (German) Program of Kenyatta University, the main trainer of teachers of German for secondary schools in Kenya, there is not a single module aimed at equipping the trainee teachers with skills on how to deal with multilingualism in their teaching of German.

In response to the problematic, Muchira (2018) made some didactical suggestions on how the teacher, even without proficiency in the languages of the learners, could facilitate the integration of the learners' multilinguality in the German lesson. The teacher's only task would be guiding the learners to reflect upon their knowledge of language(s) and how they learn them. In doing so, the German language learning process would benefit from the learners' multilinguality while at the same time adding upon this multilinguality, creating a symbiotic cyclic relationship whose results will be heightened multilingual language learning awareness. The teacher's function would be the activation and support of the learners' multilingual language learning awareness, as will be further discussed in chapter 2.

This background points to the need to focus on the learners themselves, and this is what this study does; by investigating the learners' perception of their multilinguality, as well as their ability to negotiate the challenges (in the form of errors resulting from cross-linguistic influence) that their multilinguality might cause in the process of their learning German as a foreign language.

1.5. Structure and outline of the dissertation

The present dissertation follows the above-defined conceptualisation, and treats the learners' awareness of their multilinguality and cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili as separate but related aspects that point to the nature and

status of the multilingual language learning awareness of Kenyan learners of German. This also informs the design and arrangement of the chapters.

Chapter 2 delves into the theoretical conceptualisations guiding this study, most notably language awareness (as the bedrock of multilingual language learning awareness) and the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (defining and placing the learners' multilinguality as the constituent outcome of the multilingual's system).

Chapter 3 ushers in the empirical section of the study with explication of the development of an assessment of the learners' awareness of their multilinguality, realized in the form of an open-ended questionnaire. This is followed by an analysis if this data in chapter 4. These both address the research question "What do Kenyan learners of German know about their multilinguality and how it impacts their learning of German as a foreign language?"

In chapters 5 and 6, focus shifts to the learners' awareness of the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German. The conceptualisation of the empirical instrument used to assess this awareness (the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test) is discussed in chapter 5, followed by the analysis of the data in chapter 6. These both address the research question "How do the Kenyan learners engage with grammatical errors in the German language arising from cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili?"

In chapter 7 discusses the meaning of the study and its findings for the teaching and learning of German as a foreign language in Kenya are discussed. The study is summarized, and future research directions that could build upon as well as benefit from the current study are suggested.

2. LANGUAGE AWARENESS AND A MULTILINGUAL'S SYSTEM

Introduction

In this section, the theoretical framework that guides the present study is discussed. Focus in on language awareness, language learning awareness and multilingual language learning awareness, which form the basis of investigating a multilingual's perception of her/his multilinguality and its role in foreign language learning.

Also discussed is the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism, as it provides the features that this study attributes to a multilingual, thereby offering the perspective through which this study describes a multilingual's language system. The phenomena of crosslinguistic interaction, transfer, and crosslinguistic influence as the most observable outcomes of the interacting language systems are examined from a Dynamic Model of Multilingualism perspective, with examples drawn from the Kenyan multilingual learner of German.

2.1. Language awareness: A historical introduction

This study delves into language awareness and language learning awareness, and what it means for multilingual foreign language learners, like the Kenyan learners of German are. In the preface of the book *Language Awareness in the classroom* it is suggested that the definition of language awareness as "a person's sensitivity to and conscious perception of the nature of language and its role in human life" needs further explication (James & Garrett, 1992). This is what this chapter intends to do, with focus on learners who are multilingual. It engages with questions like: What entails language awareness for them? What about language learning awareness? How does their multilinguality fit into the concept of language learning awareness? What does language (learning) awareness mean for their (foreign) language learning? etc.

Historically, the concept of Language Awareness was birthed in the United Kingdom in the 1970s to check the learners' deteriorating performance in

school, which was blamed on the deficient language proficiency, which in turn impeded the learning process. It was initially conceived as a call to rethink teaching and learning of English language, as a measure to bridge the gap between primary and secondary school, where the use of specialist language and terminology in English proved to be too challenging for the students (Hawkins, 1984, 1999; See also James & Garrett, 1992; Schmidt, 2010).

Tinkel (in James & Garrett, 1992, pp. 100–106) explains how Language Awareness was applied in the teaching of English language over a one year "Principles of Language" course at the Oratory School in Reading in the 1980s. The course was offered within the framework of three guiding questions that were addressed in an ascending order: (1) "How should we go about defining what constitutes a language?" (2) "How does one particular language system work?" (3) "How is that particular language used?" He reports that the students' interest increased as they approached the third question, and culminated with the students acknowledging that understanding how a language (in this case English) is used stems from having an understanding of the definitions and structures of this language. This experiment illustrates and surmises what Language awareness entails:

> (…) gets the student to think of the differences between human communication in general and language in particular, and to consider the distinction between language and the measurable means by which it is conveyed. The latter distinction leads, through the systematic examination of speech sounds, intonation and stress into the second part. This part examines English word structure, lexically based word classes (noun, verb, adjective and adverb), simple, compound and complex sentence structure and discourse structure. The last part, examining language use begins with lexical meanings, moves on to meaning conveyed by structure, deictic reference, connotation, speech acts, differing levels of formality, regional dialect and register and is rounded off by emphasising the changing nature of language (p. 101)

As demonstrated, language awareness allows for the breaking down of language into smaller palatable parts for the learners; it allows them to have a good look into the phenomenon called language, take it apart, examine it closely, and see

how the parts and systems that make it up are constituted and how they work, severally and together. This gives them an insight into what makes language hence gives them a better understanding of how it works. In the process of this demystification, as Tinkel observed, the learners' interest in the language grows, which can only have a positive impact on the learning of languages.

Another important aspect to consider in the Language awareness approach is the presentation of the material to be learned. Tinkel emphasizes on the careful choice of the mode of presentation of the topic to be learned, so as to avoid getting into theoretical rhetoric, and instead emphasize on the core function of language, which is its communication.[31] In doing so, one avoids falling back into the out-dated grammar-translation method of teaching. It is also important to let the learners explore the language phenomenon by themselves. This exploration will lead to discovery, which will lead to even more inquisitiveness leading to more exploration and discovery; an ever-growing cycle which makes for autonomous self-driven learners. By taking this approach, the learners are more likely to take the role of active participants rather than mere recipients of the learning process. As a result, the content taught will does not take a prescriptivist-normativist interpretation, but rather remain factual (Tinkel, 1992, p. 103).

2.2. Defining Language Awareness

This study ascribes to the position of The Association for Language Awareness (ALA), who define Language Awareness as:

> [E]xplicit knowledge about language, and conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching, and language use**.** It covers a wide spectrum of fields. For example, Language Awareness issues include exploring the benefits that can be derived from developing a good knowledge about language, a conscious understanding of how languages work, of how people learn them and use them ('About Association for Language Awareness', 2019).

[31] Tinkel gives the example of teaching the use of stress and intonation in the English language, by using examples like the slogan of a waste disposal company "we will not refuse your refuse" (James & Garrett. p. 102)

By making reference to "explicit knowledge about language", this definition makes it clear that it language awareness concerns itself with more than just the knowledge of a language, but also takes language as a subject matter worth of consideration in its own right, and encompasses knowledge about language (See also Andrews, 2003, p. 83). The clause "[…] conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, teaching and use" infer deliberate and analytical reflexivity in pursuit of these activities; in that language teachers, learners, and users are prudent and discerning in their dealing with language. This is further elaborated in the domains of language awareness.

2.3. The domains of Language awareness

2.3.1. The Affective domain

This domain focuses on the emotive side of languages and language learning. Donmall (cit. in James & Garrett, 1992. p. 13) states that the affective domain concerns itself with the "forming of attitudes, awakening and developing attention, sensitivity, curiosity, interest, and aesthetic response". That what learners feel about the language(s) they are supposed to learn plays a big role in determining how well they will learn these languages has been underscored by educational psychologists, as stated by Gardner, 1995 p.6 cit. in Dörnyei (1998, p. 122): "[…] students' attitudes towards the specific language group are bound to influence how successful they will be in incorporating aspects of that language." The relevance of this domain plays out in the Kenyan linguistic field, where the importance and superiority of English is ingrained in the learners' minds from a very young age, resulting a determination to master the language and be counted in the elite class of English speakers. [32]

The affective domain also extends to the learners' motivation for learning a language, especially in the case of foreign languages, some of which are offered as optional subjects in schools (e.g. German in Kenya), and are also regarded as prestige languages. It is important that the enthusiasm that led the learners to choose the foreign language is maintained throughout learning duration.

[32] See Section 1.3.

Muchira (2018), in her exploration of a language awareness approach to teaching of German as a foreign language in Kenya forwarded that the Kenyan teachers of German should create a good learning atmosphere by ensuring that the German language classes are lively and interesting, and learners look forward to them. A good learning atmosphere goes a long way in keeping the motivation of learners alive, especially among learners for whom the classroom is central to their learning.[33]

2.3.2. The Social domain

Language Awareness was conceptualized in the context of a growing multilingualism in Britain, where the languages of the immigrants had rendered the region's endogenous languages a minority (James & Garrett, 1992, p. 13). The school was a converging point for all the cultures and languages present in Britain, and was seen as an opportunity to foster tolerance and harmony. Language Awareness was seen as an apt tool for this purpose and its objective would be "to foster better relations between all ethnic groups by arousing pupils' awareness of the origins and characteristics of their own language and dialect and their place in the wider map of languages and dialects used in the world beyond" (Donmall, 1985, p. 8 cit. in James & Garrett, 1992, p.13)

The need for such tolerance and acceptance could not be more urgent for a country like Kenya, where the multiethnolingual composition of the citizenry is sometimes a recipe for conflict and misunderstanding. These conflicts are labelled "tribal/ethnic clashes", and are understood to be tribes/ethnic groups sharing an indigenous Kenyan language fighting against others who speak a different language. The intolerance is worsened by a continued subjugation of the indigenous languages by institutional practices, which have in turn adversely influenced Kenyans' attitudes towards these languages. As a result, there is a widespread belief that the Kenyan indigenous languages are not good for anything else, other than sowing strife and causing inter-ethnic tension and conflict. Taking a Language Awareness approach in the teaching of languages in

[33] Discussed in Section 4.3.

Kenyan schools would aid in cultivating acceptance and appreciation of the cultural and linguistic diversity represented by the various tribes/ethnic groups that make up Kenya, since as Hawkins opined, "linguistic tolerance does not come naturally; it has to be learned and to be worked at" (1984, p. 17)

2.3.3. The power domain

"In the power domain, Language Awareness was intended to alert people to the potential for language to be used as an instrument for manipulation" (Cenoz, Finkbeiner & White in May, & Durk, 2017, p. 6). This sensitization includes empowering learners to read through and beneath the words used, so as to figure out what their hidden meaning could be. James & Garrett (1992, p. 14) specifically mention the (mass) media and those who have access to it, and point out to the need to equip people with the know-how to negotiate these language manipulations.

The question of language and power has been further addressed in Fairclough's Critical Language Awareness, in which the language use (referred to as "discourse") – society - power relationship is discussed. He posits that these are engaged in a never-ending contestation, in which each shapes and is being shaped by the other (Fairclough, 2014, pp. 7–12). By taking a Critical Language Awareness approach, these relationships are examined with the aim of enabling a better understanding of how they work. This empowerment is imperative if people are to be effective participants in the society, as Fairclough says: "given that power relations work increasingly at an implicit level through language, and given that language practices are increasingly targets for control, a critical awareness of language is a prerequisite for effective citizenship and a democratic entitlement" (Fairclough, 2014. p. 12)

2.3.4. The cognitive domain

The cognitive domain aims at the establishment of language as a subject of study in its own right (as opposed to just a medium of communication). It focuses on sensitizing the learners' to language patterns, contrast, systems, units, categories, rules of language in use, etc. (See also Cenoz et al., 2017, p. 5-6; James

& Garrett, 1992, p. 15). In line with the goals of improving the education standards in Britain and the students' performance in school, proponents of Language Awareness emphasized on the importance of equipping the learners with knowledge about language, as this would help them not only understand how language is made up, but also how it works: "if we are to help students function intellectually – and we take this to be the prime purpose of education - we must spend time in English classes examining words and how each contributes to the meaning of a sentence" (James & Garrett, 1992, p. 15).

James and Garret are however careful about this emphasis on the "forms of language", and caution against the danger of falling into the "arid decontextualized grammar-grind of pre-war parsing"[34] (p. 15). While sensitizing learners to the forms of language (thereby turning it into subject matter), the core function of language should not be forgotten, hence the need to contextualise the content by not losing focus of the meaning. This calls for a balancing act between focusing on form and meaning, having in mind that they complement each other.

By sensitizing the learners to the structure of form of language, the cognitive domain also serves as a base for foreign language teaching using a comparative/contrastive approach (Finkbeiner & white Cenoz et al., 2017, pp. 5–6). When confronted with the grammar of a new language, the knowledge that the learners have of and about language(s) is used as a resource to facilitate the learning of the new language. This is the thought behind language teaching and learning approaches like Tertiary Language Didactics, DaFnE, EuroCom etc. (discussed in 1.1). In the development and application of theses didactic approaches, the learners' knowledge (of and about languages), experiences, as well as skills and techniques they have developed in the course of their language learning are made use of so as to enhance foreign language learning. By investigating the learners' awareness of their interacting language systems, this study is largely based on the cognitive domain.

[34] They are most likely referring to the defunct Grammar-Translation Method

2.3.5. The performance domain

James & Garret (1992) regard the performance domain as the most contentious, since the relationship between an awareness of language and its proficiency remains unclear: "The issue is whether knowing about language improves one's performance or command of the language; that is whether analytical knowledge impinges on language behaviour (p. 17)." This is the same tension that was discussed under the interface position of explicit and implicit language learning and knowledge (Section 1.2.2.)

This contestation has been the subject of various studies on explicit and implicit language learning and knowledge, with varying conclusions. Bialystok (1979, p. 82-83) suggests that "situational constraints" that include time, task at hand and the specific linguistic structure will determine whether the learner/speaker falls back on knowledge about language to improve proficiency; when holding a conversation, there is not much time to keep making checks and balances, hence the tendency to draw more upon knowledge of language while writing a letter allows more time to refer to knowledge about language, which is used a reference point for accuracy. Krashen (1981, p. 1-2) makes the distinction between language acquisition and learning, positing that speakers who have acquired a language do not focus on form rather on the meaning of their communication, while error correction and the presentation of rules and structures of the target language help language learners immensely. Ellis (1993, p. 290) posits that explicit knowledge about language can serve as a basis for mastery of some grammatical phenomena, which in turn leads to improved proficiency:

> […] older children and adults can acquire and act upon rules and schemata; they can, for example, be taught grammatical rules for forming a plural. Thus other L2 teaching approaches are heavily rule-based and hold that explicit knowledge is a necessary, or at any rate a desirable, precursor of implicit knowledge.

For the German language learners in the Kenyan secondary schools, the first contact with the German language is in the classroom, where their teachers –in

the course of the weekly lessons- guide them through the learning process. Using the prescribed course books, the learners are introduced to the grammar and structure of the German language, upon which the learners grow their knowledge of the German language. Seeing that it is a foreign language, the learners have little to no contact with the language outside the classroom. It could therefore be said that for these learners of German in Kenyan secondary schools, their knowledge about the German language greatly influences their knowledge of the language and thus their proficiency. For the Kenyan situation, Weskamp's postulation that the development of explicit (knowledge about language) provided the basis upon which the implicit (knowledge of knowledge) knowledge develops rings true:

> Während sich beim Muttersprachenerwerb implizites Wissen zuerst entwickelt und explizites, metalinguistisches Wissen später hinzukommt. ist das Verhältnis beim schulischen Erwerb anderer Sprachen anders gelagert. In Abhängigkeit von der Unterrichtsmethodik und von individuellen Lernerunterschieden (wie Alter, Motivation, kognitiver Stil, Persönlichkeit usw.) entwickeln sich explizite und implizite wissen parallel oder nacheinander, wobei im letzen Fall das explizite dem impliziten Wissen vorangeht (Weskamp, 2007, p. 80).

This is further echoed by Roberts in his postulation that the mastery of a language by learning it follows a different process than if one acquires it, since "(…) the L2 learner has to focus initially on form rather than function" (Roberts, 2011, p. 127). He proceeds to cite Vygotsky (1935, p. 48), who in making the distinction between first language acquisition and subsequent language learning states:

> (L1) begins with free spontaneous use of speech and culminates in the conscious realization of linguistic forms and their mastery, then L2 begins with the conscious realization of language and arbitrary command of it and culminates in spontaneous free speech (Roberts. p. 127)

These sentiments echo those discussed in the postulation of the German language learning in Kenyan secondary schools taking a strong interface position

(1.2.2.4). By the foregoing, it is plausible to argue that the Language Awareness (embodied by explicit grammatical knowledge of the German language) affects the learners' performance, as will be further explored in chapter 4.

2.4. Language Awareness and foreign language teaching and learning: Relevance to German as a foreign language

After conducting the Principles of Language course at The Oratory School over a period of seven years (See 2.1.), the findings on the effectiveness of the course were summed up as follows (Tinkel, 1992, p. 103-104):

> (i) As the students explore, they become more aware; as they become more aware, they also expand and perhaps even improve their grasp of language.
> (ii) As the students become more aware of how language works, they become more sensitive to how they use it and, equally vital in these days of bombardments with words, how it is used upon them.
> (iii) Possessing a technical understanding of language effects underpins appreciation of their use and satisfies a hunger among young people to know how language works and how it is used.

Based on this success, the course was introduced to other groups of learners, including second-years pupils having trouble with learning a foreign language at Hitchingbrook. This goes to show that the concept of Language Awareness had from the onset set sights on improving not only the learning of English but also other subjects and languages. James and Garret (1992, pp.10-11) highlight this by citing the Draft orders pertaining to the modern languages teaching in the National Curriculum, that state that the modern language study should:

> (a) [E]xtend the pupil's linguistic knowledge, skills and understanding
> (b) [L]ay a foundation for learning any subsequent foreign languages
> (c) [W]iden the pupil's cultural horizons and promote international understanding.

Knowledge of a language is more meaning oriented, while knowledge about a language is more form oriented. In the current communicative approach to foreign language didactics (including German as a foreign language), emphasis is on functionality in language use to enable communication, while emphasis on grammaticality is regarded as stiff normative prescriptivism. However, there are instances when ungrammaticality affects communication, meaning that grammatical correctness cannot be ignored in totality. This is why even small children, in the course of acquiring their first languages, have been observed to correct themselves in adherence to the defined linguistic norms (Roberts, 2011). The didactics of German as a foreign language must aim to strike a balance between form and function. Moreover, there are contexts where form (as explicit grammar) seems to take centre stage - like in the Kenyan schools (discussed in 1.4. and further in 4.4.). These contexts cannot be disregarded as "going about it the wrong way", but rather, measures should be taken to enhance the learning experience and help the learners reach their goals.

2.5. Language Learning Awareness

While the concept of Language Awareness focuses on improving learners' sensitivity to language and how it works, it also factors in the learner, who is at the centre and is the main beneficiary of a successful language learning process, laying the basis of the concept of Language Learning Awareness. As James and Garret put it:

> A somewhat different are of LA [Language Awareness] concerns the language learners' awareness of how they can best master a second language. Here LA is not concerned with explicit knowledge about language or about languages, but with learners' perceptions about the process of language learning and their awareness of themselves in that process (James & Garrett, 1992, p. 98).

Language Learning awareness refers to a learners' sensitivity to his/her language learning behaviour. It involves the learners thinking about how best they learn a language, based on the experiences they have made so far. Neuner (in Hufeisen et al., 2004, p. 23) refers to it as "learning to learn", in which

learners get to reflect upon questions like: "What type of learner am I?" "What motivates me to learn?" "What do I need in order to feel comfortable learning?" "How do I do my homework?" "How, for example, do I learn new words?" "How do I approach a text I have never seen before?" etc.

Language learning awareness starts with the "awareness of needs", which means that the learners are cognizant of their reasons and objectives for learning the foreign language (See Chryshochoos in James & Garrett, 1992, pp. 148–162). This awareness contributes a big deal to the learner's motivation for learning and mastering the target language.[35] This is especially relevant, because in many contexts (like the Kenyan one), foreign languages are not compulsory school subjects, meaning that learners choose to learn them. When the needs and interests of the learners are kept in sight, then the lesson can be developed around these, to ensure that the learners' motivation is sustained.[36]

It is also crucial that learners are aware of learning strategies that work for them. Learning strategies have been defined by (Oxford, 2006, p. 8) as "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferrable to new situations". Multilingual foreign language learners usually have already developed some strategies in the course of learning prior language(s), even if unconsciously. By having them reflect about these, they will realize that there are strategies that work better than others, and exploit these to optimize their language learning experience. Chapter 4 (section 4.3) discusses learning strategies deemed as most effective by Kenyan learners of German.

[35] Motivation and German Language learning in Kenya discussed in 1.4.1

[36] From experience, there are instances when learners insist that that they are learning German in their pursuit of specific interests, and will sometimes ask for phrases and vocabulary to discuss, football, music, medicine etc. - even in the first days of a beginners' course. While it is difficult to tailor the general language lesson to the learners' individual needs, the teacher should find a way to accommodate their specificities by finding alternate ways to help the learners, e.g. by sourcing supplementary material that is language level-appropriate, helping them find tandem partners who share similar interests and, encourage learners to form or join interactive groups (via social media; Facebook, WhatsApp) in which they could explore and practice their target language in line with their interests etc. This resonates with the tertiary language didactics' principles of orientation of texts and context to ensure they remain relevant to the learners (See also Neuner in Hufeisen et al., 2004, pp. 29–30)

This study suggests that the learner's preferences of learning materials as well as the social forms employed in the classroom should also be considered as part of language learning awareness. As discussed in chapter 4, Kenyan learners of German expressed their preferences for various teaching and learning material e.g. story books, magazines, comics, internet etc., thereby calling for the teachers to try as much as possible to incorporate these in the lessons to supplement the prescribed course book(s). The same applies to the social forms, meaning that the teacher should allow for activities preferred by the learners in order to create an optimal learning atmosphere.

By the foregoing, it is evident that language learning awareness is key to successful foreign language learning, as the learner takes control of his/her learning process (thereby developing learner autonomy). As such, every teacher of (foreign) languages should work towards its enhancement, as Holec (1980 p. 3) puts it: "Learner awareness and foreign language learning can be seen as inseparable, because it seems that the latter largely depends on the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (cit. in Oxford, 2006, p. 150)

2.6. Multilingual language learning awareness

After looking at the concepts of language awareness and language learning awareness, this study then explores what this means for multilingual language learners, hence the expansion to multilingual language learning awareness. The understanding of what makes a multilingual is derived from this study's working definition of multilinguality in section 1.2.1 and discussed further under the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (from 2.9 below), and it means an individual who has a mastery of more than one language at any level of proficiency, including partial competence and incomplete fluency, as well as metalinguistic awareness, learning strategies and opinions, preferences and passive or active knowledge on languages, language use and language learning/ acquisition.

Aronin & Singleton (2012, p. 82) have summarized the characteristics of a multilingual as represented in various studies over the years, showing that multilinguals:

1. [H]ave larger overall linguistic repertoires and can participate in a wider range of language situations;
2. [M]ay possess cognitive advantages relating to a configuration of linguistic competences which is distinct from that observed in bilinguals and monolinguals;
3. [M]ay develop new language learning skills;
4. [T]end to use more learning strategies and to use such strategies more frequently, adding their own strategies to those suggested by their teachers;
5. [S]eem to have enhanced metalinguistic awareness;
6. [T]end to be adept at the art of balancing their communicative requirements with their language resources, making appropriate use of appropriate languages;
7. [A]ppear to acquire greater sensitivity to socio-pragmatic aspects of communication, navigating confidently through complex environments;
8. [A]re more responsive to both linguistic and non-linguistic factors in communicative situations;
9. [H]ave a greater array of identities, which are characterized by fluidity.

While a multilingual could be in possession of some or all these qualities, s/he might not be cognizant of this fact, hence do not know the kind of linguistic resources they are in possession of. Discovering this resource and optimizing it for the learning process is where language awareness comes in. Multilingual language learning awareness sets out to sensitize the multilingual language learners to the content and workings of their multilingual systems, with the aim of empowering them to make use of them, especially in language learning instances.

Even as studies show that multilinguality is advantageous to foreign language learning (Hufeisen et al., 2004; Hufeisen, Neuner, & Europarat, 2005; Marx & Hufeisen, 2010), there are still issues that arise from the interaction of languages and language systems in a multilingual's mind that could inhibit the foreign language learning process. These include phenomena like negative transfer and (native language) interference (Odlin, 1989 p. 26), which – as the term

"interference" implies- impede the learning process. This study is based on the understanding that heightened multilingual language learning awareness would enable the multilingual learner sift between the negative and positive effects of her/his multilinguality, and in doing so empower them to harness the resources that their multilinguality offers so as to improve their language learning experience. It therefore lays the groundwork by establishing the nature and status of this awareness among the Kenyan learners of German, and builds upon the existing theories and models of multilingual language learning that exist so far.

2.7. Theories and models of multilingual language learning

Investigations into the role and place of a learner's multilinguality in language learning has informed the development of various theories and models in a bid to explain the relationship between multilingualism, multilinguality and language learning and acquisition. Some of these include:

- The Foreign Language Acquisition Model (FLAM) (Groseva, 1998)
- The Factor model (Hufeisen, 2000)
- The Role-Function Model (Williams & Hammarberg, 1998; Hammarberg, 2001)
- The Ecological Model of Multilinguality (Aronin & Ò Laoire, 2004)
- The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner, 2002)

2.7.1. The Foreign Language Acquisition Model (FLAM)

Groseva in (Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998, pp. 21–30) introduces the Foreign Language Acquisition model, in which she advances that all successive foreign language learning is built upon the learner's L2 knowledge through which a learner engages - consciously or unconsciously - in a process of building and testing of hypothesis on the structure and vocabulary of the L3 (Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998, p. 22).

According to Groseva, this process of starts with the learning of L2, where by the learner through generalization and simplification comes up with a 1:1

correlation between L1 and L2. Due to differences in language systems and structures, the learner's L2 will be marked with interferences from L1, which the learner keeps correcting (hence improving the L2 mastery), following feedback from the interlocutors.

When learning an L3, the learner's L2 knowledge becomes the reference point for building and testing on hypotheses on L3. This is because learning of an L2 is a conscious process (compared to the acquisition of L1), through which the learner accesses the target language's grammar, rules and structures, learning and communication strategies etc. This marked difference between L1 and L2 makes it easier for a learner to use L2 as a fallback and reference point when learning L3. The key to effectiveness is training learners to consciously apply their L2 knowledge and learning strategies in the learning of L3 (Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998, p.23).

2.7.2. The Factor model

The factors that differentiate an L2 learner from an L3 (and additional/tertiary languages) learner are discussed by Hufeisen in (Rosenthal, 2000, pp. 209–229). In this model, she posits that the L2 learner is largely inexperienced in matters language learning (seeing that L1 mastery is achieved through acquisition), while the L3 learner is a "competent language learner", due to experience gained in the course of learning an L2 (Hufeisen, 2000, p. 213).

The acquisition of the L1 is influenced by a child's innate capability for languages as well as the quality and quantity of the input from the environment in which the child grows. As Marx & Hufeisen (2003, pp. 184-185) discuss, the learner, at the onset of learning an L2, brings their natural learning abilities with them into the new learning environment (the classroom). They have, in addition, developed some general life and learning experiences (seeing that they are a bit older) as well as some learning strategies (since they are already learning other subjects in school). Other factors that play a role in L2 learning include the learner's drive to learn the new language (motivation), and his/her aptitude for

learning new languages. The learner's L1 is also developed, and this forms a foundation for additional language learning.

When learning an L3, all the factors involved in the L1 acquisition and L2 learning come into play. Added onto this are factors specific to foreign language learning e.g. experiences, strategies, as well as knowledge of personal learner type. The learner's linguistic system has expanded to include the learned L2, and this forms a base for a deeper comprehension of language and linguistic systems.

Going by this model, The L3 learner should not be considered "tabula rasa" in matters language learning, seeing that s/he has accumulated a treasure of knowledge, experiences, and strategies in the course of L1 acquisition and L2 learning. These should be used to accelerate the L3 learning process (Hufeisen et al., 2004).

2.7.3. The Role-Function Model

The Role-functions model as presented by Habermann (in Cenoz et al., 2001; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998) describes how a multilingual's languages affect speech production in foreign language acquisition. The study used language switches to describe the different roles that a learner's L1 and L2 play in the course of L3 acquisition. It established that one language plays the instrumental role ("used as a tool to facilitate communication in the form of metalinguistic comments, asides, requests for help etc." (Williams & Hammarberg, 1998, p. 304)), while the other takes the default supplier role (the language whose structure is the default fallback in the learner's attempt at lexical, morphological and phonological realizations). The model concludes that the instrumental role is determined by the "speaker's personal identification with a certain language, the speaker's knowledge of which languages are known to the interlocutor, and the interlocutor's response and shown attitude to choice of language" (Habermann, 2001 p. 36), while the choice for the default supplier is determined by typology, proficiency, recency and L2 status (Habermann, 2001 p. 36; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998, p. 322).

2.7.4. The Ecological Model of Multilinguality

Aronin & Ò Laoire in (Hoffmann & Ytsma, 2004, pp. 11–29) examine the complexity surrounding multilingualism and multilinguality in a social context. They understand multilinguality as an individual's linguistic identity, which "includes cognitive and linguistic abilities, potential to gain knowledge, self-image as a language-learner, preferences and the tangible impact of the cultural context" (Aronin & Ò Laoire, 2004, p. 19). They advance an ecological model of looking at multilinguality, as this allows for the incorporation of the individual character, the language aspect, as well as the socio-cultural context[37] in which one finds her/himself, as read from their statement: "The sociolinguistic environment or cultural context, therefore plays a decisive role in the structure and 'specifications' of multilinguality" (Aronin & Ò Laoire, 2004, p. 24).

For Aronin & Ò Laoire, " the term 'biotic system' is consonant with the term 'eco' in describing the ecological phenomenon intrinsic to the nature cycle, thus emphasizing the essential dynamics of growth, change, fluctuation, input, absorption and decay, (…)" (Aronin & Ò Laoire, 2004, p. 19) The ecological model of multilinguality thus posits that an individual's multilinguality is in constant change, and that the process of multilingual acquisition including structuralized language learning is marked by the following features: complexity, interrelatedness, fluctuation, variation and inconsistency, multifunctionality, inequality of function, self-balance, self-extension, non-replication. [38]

2.7.5. The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism

Also taking a biotic approach to multilinguality is Herdina and Jessner's Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (DMM), whose features "include a psycholinguistic focus on the systems-theoretic approach that is based on research on the behaviour of living systems and a dynamic interpretation of the systems mode. In the words of (Marx & Hufeisen, 2003, p. 156):

[37] Hufeisen (2003, p. 2) explains that Aronin & Ò Laoire use "ecological" to refer to the cultural contexts in which multilinguality should be investigated.
[38] These 9 characteristics of individual multilingualism or multilinguality are explained in detail in (Hoffmann & Ytsma, 2004, pp. 11–29)

> This model is unique in that it attempts to incorporate and redefine the traditional distinctions of FLA (First language acquisition), SLA (second language Acquisition) and TLA (Third/Tertiary language Acquisition) within one wholistic model—wholistic because it tries to view the phenomena observed in language processes as a whole and not merely as its parts. As well, it is holistic in that it assumes that a multilingual system will have properties that its parts, i.e. individual language systems, cannot be shown to consist of.

Given this wholistic and holistic approach to multilinguality, this study bases its understanding and examination of the multilingual's system on the DMM, which takes a holistic approach, which is discussed in detail in section 2.8.

2.8. Multilingual Language learning awareness in the Kenyan context

Taking a multilingual language learning awareness approach in the teaching of languages is especially relevant for contexts like Kenya, where language policies and the societal attitudes towards languages have created a triglossic setting, with English being most prestigious and the indigenous languages (which are the L1s of most learners) being very lowly regarded.

Language learning awareness - and the development of theories and models of multilingualism - in the foreign language classrooms in Europe and the UK is primarily conceptualized as building upon the learners' knowledge of their mother tongues (L1) in the teaching and learning of second and foreign languages (Hawkins, 1984, 1999; Hufeisen et al., 2005; James & Garrett, 1992; Gerhard Neuner, 2009). This approach would however not work in Kenya, because learners are encouraged (if not forced) to suppress their L1 indigenous languages.[39,40] In the Kenyan context, it would be more of a cart-before-the-horse approach, which would entail using the institutionalized language lessons (English, Kiswahili, and the offered foreign languages) as the platform for bringing the learners' indigenous languages into the classroom. As suggested by Muchira (2018) the teachers would use the foreign (in this case German)

[39] See 1.3
[40] 11 out of 39 study participants (28%) did not list a Kenyan indigenous language as part of their linguistic repertoire (response to questionnaire)

language lesson to ease the indigenous languages into the classroom, thereby sensitizing the learners on their languages and other languages in their sociolinguistic space.

Bringing the learners' indigenous languages into the classroom would be a big step towards getting the learners to change their mindsets regarding these languages, an exercise that would involve all the domains of language awareness. As the learners explore and reflect upon them, their structural and grammatical make-up and how they work, they will be engaged in a process of deconstructing the belief that they are only fit to be relegated to the small family space. When the learners make comparisons of the foreign language lesson content and their languages, they realize that their languages also measure up to others.

While Kamwangamalu (2010, p. 12) argues that the only way to make African indigenous languages appealing is to commodify them, and (Ouedraogo, 2002) calls upon the African states to valorize the African languages by creating employment positions requiring mastery of an African language, this study posits that taking the language awareness way will promote the learners' appreciation for their languages, even when there are no direct occupational and/or monetary gains to be made. In exploring their languages, learners will access the wealth and cultural heritage that their languages carry, seeing that as Ngugi wa Thing'o puts it, "language as culture is the collective memory bank of a people's experience in history" (Wa Thiong'o, 1986, p. 15).

Furthermore, in a Dynamic Model of Multilingualism's understanding of a multilingual's system as comprising intertwined language systems, it becomes clear that due to this interconnectedness, improving any part of an individual's linguistic system has a positive effect on the entire system. As such, using the German lesson to sensitize the Kenyan learners on their indigenous languages contributes to the wholesome development of the learner's multilingual system, which in turn make them better German language learners. The interconnectedness hence interdependence of the multilingual system is discussed finer detail in the following section.

2.9. DMM's view of interconnected and interdependent language systems

In their description of the DMM, Herdina & Jessner state that it

> [P]rovides the necessary conceptual psycholinguistic framework for modelling multilingual proficiency, putting special emphasis on individual learner differences in language acquisition. It describes the language systems of a bi- or multilingual reacting differently to identical input in different situations, that is, different languages commanded by the same speaker which are viewed as separate systems (LS_1, LS_2, LS_3, etc.)[41] exhibiting different properties. (2002, p. 75)

DMM is developed on the premise that language and language development is an individualized dynamic process involving various variables, whose interconnectedness and interactions influence the individual's overall linguistic system. It is apt in describing a multilingual's linguistic system due to its accommodation and consideration of the various factors that constitute and contribute to the dynamic system's development, including the separate linguistic systems (LS) that make up a multilingual's linguistic repertoire, the sociolinguistic environment in which these linguistic systems develop, the individual learner's aptitude for and motivation towards languages and language learning, etc.

In addition, DMM in defining a multilingual's language mastery process considers language competence as a variable and indefinite state that is in constant motion depending on the factors mentioned above (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 75). This means that the mastery process is not always on an upward trajectory, but sometimes suffers setbacks, which are manifested by instances of plateauing or

[41] In line with the Dynamic Systems theoretic approach, in which languages are understood to be complex and dynamic systems in nature, DMM bases its discussion on Language Systems (LS) and not languages (L). As such, LS_1 refers to the First Language System, LS_2 to the Second etc. (Herdina & Jessner, 2002)

even regression. The previously learned/acquired language systems of the multilingual learners are also important variables in the foreign language mastery process, and their interaction sometimes hampers the process and other times expedite it. These are realities of multilingual language learning that the DMM takes into account:

> This model, taking the wholistic view of bilingualism into account, stresses the fact that an adequate description of multilingualism must comprise not only transfer phenomena including codeswitching, language mixing, language attrition, but also the positive cognitive consequences of multilingualism (e.g. enhanced metalinguistic and metacognitive abilities, divergent thinking), which become apparent if certain social and cognitive conditions are met. Multilingual proficiency is, therefore, to be considered as consisting of dynamically interacting linguistic subsystems which themselves do not necessarily represent any kind of constant but are subject to variation (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 75)

By the foregoing, this study understands a multilingual as a participant in a sociolinguistic space that determines her/his linguistic needs. S/he comes into contact with the various LS at different times and under different circumstances, and uses them at different levels of competence and frequencies to meet her/his communicative needs. S/he has formed different attitudes towards these LS, and is motivated in varying ways towards mastering them. All these factors come together in determining the development of a multilingual's proficiency, hence the dynamic systems theoretic approach, as it allows and calls for the consideration and inclusion of all the interacting factors that influence the development of a multilingual's linguistic system, and offers a holistic perspective into the dynamism and complexity that shapes it.

2.9.1. The Dynamic Systems Theory

As mentioned, the DMM holistic approach to multilinguality offers this study a basis for discussing a multilingual's linguistic system. It is based on the Dynamic Systems Theory (DST), which is defined by (De Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007, p. 7) as "the science of complex systems". Complex systems are described as "sets

of interacting variables" (De Bot, Verspoor, & Lowie, 2005), and are characterized as follows:

- In many complex systems, the outcome of development over time cannot be predicted, not because we lack the right tools to measure it, but because variables that interact keep changing over time.
- Dynamic systems are always part of another system, going from submolecular particles to the universe.
- As they develop over time, dynamic sub-systems appear to settle in specific states, which are preferred but unpredictable, so-called 'attractor states'. States that are never preferred and settled in and are so-called 'repeller states'.
- Systems develop through iterations of simple procedures that are applied over and over again, with the output of the preceding iteration as the input of the next.
- Complexity emerges out of the iterative application of simple procedures; therefore, it is not necessary to postulate innate knowledge.
- The development of a dynamic system appears to be highly dependent on its beginning state. Minor differences at the beginning can have dramatic consequences in the long run. This is called 'the butterfly effect', a term proposed by the meteorologist Lorentz to account for the huge impact small local effects may have on global weather.
- In dynamic systems, changes in one variable have an impact on all other variables that are part of the system: systems are fully interconnected.
- In natural systems, development is dependent on resources: (…), all natural systems will tend to entropy when no additional energy is added to the system.
- Systems develop through interaction with their environment and through internal self-reorganisation.
- Because systems are constantly in flow, they will show variation, which makes them sensitive to specific input at a given point in time and some other input at another point in time.

Due to these qualities, DST has been appropriated to explain and describe language and language development in individuals, due its complexity and

dynamism. Larsen-Freeman (1997) describes language as a complex linear system, whose dynamism is characterized by the active process of performance, diachronic and synchronic growth and change, as well as the constant transformation accompanying every instance of language use. As such, language is always in motion, given that, as she quotes Diller (1995 p. 116), "[t]he act of using language meaningfully has a way of changing the grammar system in the user" (Larsen-Freeman, 1997, p. 148). Since the language user is a part of a practicing community, this then means that the change in the user will spread out in the course of interaction, and this might lead to a shift in a global scale.[42] In so doing, the language system (langue) keeps changing due to the linguistic practices (parole) of its users. This is what Larsen-Freeman refers to when she states: "[r]ather than using rules to shape discourse, the rules themselves are shaped by discourse" (Larsen-Freeman,1997. p. 148). [43]

For Larsen-Freeman, the complexity of language is evidenced by its composition, in that " first, it is composed of many subsystems: phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, second, the subsystems are interdependent; a change in any of them can result in a change in others" (Larsen-Freeman. 1997 p. 149), and how this composition affects its character: "[t]he behavior of the whole emerges out of the interaction of the subsystems" (Larsen-Freeman, 1997, p.149).

2.9.2. The DMM's holistic approach to multilinguality

The DMM builds on Cook's notion of multicompetence (Cook, 1991, 1992) and Grosjean's Bilingual View (Grosjean, 1985), both taking a wholistic approach to multilingualism and multilinguality, and conceptualised to counter the

[42] A recent example is the adoption of the tag line "sco pa tu manaa" on social media (especially on Twitter) while asking for people's opinions on various issues. While the phrase itself has been described as gibberish with no meaning in any known language, its use continues to flourish, and it already has an entry in the Urban Dictionary ('Urban Dictionary: Sco Pa Tu Manaa', 2019 Last accessed 08.08.18 1747CET). Its first recorded use was by the Ghanaian artist patapaa Amisty in the song "Daavi ne ba"

[43] I see this, for instance, in the continuous update of dictionaries (langue) to include words that are made up in the course of practice and discourse (parole) ('New Dictionary Words | Sep 2017 | Merriam-Webster', 2017 (Last accessed 22.03.2018 1632CET; 'Recent updates to the OED', 2018 Last accessed 22.03.18 1630CET).

traditional view of a bilingual/multilingual as a sum of two/multiple monolinguals.

2.9.2.1. *The bilingual or wholistic view of bilingualism*

Grosjean, in response to the monolingual (or fractional) view of bilingualism, proposes the bilingual or wholistic view of bilingualism. The fractional view holds that a bilingual -

> Has (or should have) two separate and isolable language competencies; these competencies are (or should be) similar to those of the two corresponding monolinguals; therefore, the bilingual is (or should be) two monolinguals in one person (Grosjean, 1985, p. 468).

This led to the stratification into *balanced bilingualism* i.e. a person is "equally and fully fluent in two languages", which was idealised as *true bilingualism* (of which there are very few), and the other *special types* (dominant, unbalanced, semilingual, alingual etc.), despite the fact that this is where a vast majority of bilingual speakers lie (Grosjean, 1985, p. 468.).

The fractional view also led to development of tests, which did not take into consideration that each of the bilingual's languages develops at different levels, depending on their uses and needs. Since these tests are developed on the basis of "true bilingualism", they consequently cast the bilinguals as less proficient compared to monolinguals. These perceptions drove research on bilingualism to highlight the negative effects of bilingualism, with bilinguals being viewed as "accidental" and "anomalous", notwithstanding that bilingualism is the norm. It is therefore not surprising, that this negatively affected (and still affects) the bilinguals' perception of their bilingualism.[44] (See Grosjean, 1985, pp. 469-471)

To challenge this perception, Grosjean developed the bilingual or wholistic view of bilingualism, based on the premise that: "The bilingual is NOT the sum of two

[44] This unfortunate view persists to date, at least in the English-speaking world, with non-native speakers being mocked for not speaking "proper English", or exhibiting cross-linguistic influence from their other languages. It has in turn led to the creation of memes with messages like "making fun of my accent? I am bilingual/trilingual/Polyglot" etc.

complete or incomplete monolinguals; rather, he or she has a unique and specific linguistic configuration. The co-existence and constant interaction of the two languages in the bilingual has produced a different but complete language system" (1985, p. 471). What this means, is that a bilingual's languages coexist in the brain, and they interact with hence influence each other, effectively altering each other. As it has been established, even the first language of a multilingual gets changed by the presence of another language (See also Cook, 2003).

In addition to the language system of a bilingual developing in a way that is unique due to the blend of her/his languages, Grosjean argues that these languages develop according to the sociolinguistic needs of the bilingual speaker, meaning that one might be more advanced than the other, or that some skills might be more developed than others. Consequently, it is possible to develop listening and speaking skills in a language without the writing and reading skills depending on the context of acquisition. As such, Grosjean argues that a bilingual is a "competent but specific speaker-hearer" (1985), whose languages develop to meet his/her linguistic needs. The bilingual therefore adopts different speech modes depending on the situation and their interlocutor; they range from a monolingual speech mode (if conversing with a monolingual, or the situation calls for a single language use), to a bilingual speech mode (when the interlocutor is bilingual and the situation allows) (Grosjean, 1985, p. 472, See also. 1989, p. 9). It is however important to note that even in the monolingual mode, the other language of the bilingual cannot be totally shut down. The interaction –hence influence- of the languages never stops (Grosjean, 1985, p. 474).

The measurement of a bilingual's competence must take this multileveled development into account. While instances of language mixing (code switching and mixing), speech/language borrowing etc. would be considered as erroneous deviations and/or indicators of incompetence from a monolingual's perspective, they should be accommodated as markers of the unique multilingual system that has developed from the interaction of languages in the bilingual's brain. Focus should be on the communicative competence of the bilingual, and whether it is

developed enough to enable the bilingual navigate the sociolinguistic field s/he finds her/himself in. As Grosjean posits, the main question driving the measure of competency should be: "Does the stable bilingual […] meet his or her everyday communicative needs with two languages - used separately or together - and this to the same extent as the monolingual with just one language?" (1985, p. 472)

2.9.2.2. Multicompetence

The multicompetence approach to multilingualism also advances the notion of coexisting language systems in an individual's mind, in contrast to monocompetence, which refers to the state of mind with only one grammar/language. Multicompetence was developed based on the argument that for a vast majority of the human population, knowing and using many languages in their daily lives is the norm. As such, approaches that focused on homogenous (hence monolingual) speech communities would not offer adequate insights into the workings of a multilingual's mind (See Cook, 1991, pp. 113–114)

It is defined as "the compound state of mind with two grammars" (Cook, 1991, p. 112),[45] and argues that because the various languages are contained in the single mind of an individual, then they are not separate and distinct entities, but they coexist, creating a "distinct state of mind", one which is different from a monolingual (Cook, 1992, p. 559). These distinctions include an altered L1, since the coexistence of the multilingual's languages leads to their influencing and modifying each other. The other is that even when a multilingual has acquired a high proficiency of an L2, it will still differ from that of a native speaker; Cook refers to a study conducted by Coppertiers (1987), which showed that bilinguals with high proficiency in L2 French had trouble with semantic interpretations

[45] In the more recent publication, the definition of multi-competence has been expanded to "The knowledge of more than one language on the same mind or community"(in Cook & Li, 2016, p. 2). This new definition embodies the principles behind the advancement of this school of thought, as it shows that multicompetence subsumes all aspects of language (not only syntax), is not limited to the interaction of two languages, and it extends beyond the multilingual individual to consider "the multicompetence of the community" (Cook & Li, 2016, p. 3).

when subjected to a grammaticality judgment test, compared to the native French speakers (Cook, 1992, p. 562).

There is also evidence that the metalinguistic awareness of multilinguals differs from that of monolinguals. Here, reference is made to the study on *Influences of bilingualism on metalinguistic development* (Bialystok, 1987). In the mentioned study, monolingual and bilingual children were asked to judge the grammaticality of sentences despite their meaningfulness, tasks which would require them to engage the two skill components of metalinguistic knowledge: analysis of knowledge and control of processes. The findings pointed to bilingual children having a higher level of control of processes compared to the monolingual children.[46]

2.9.2.3. Multilingual proficiency: DMM's alternative to the bilingual view and multicompetence

Despite building upon Cook's approach of multicompetence, Herdina & Jessner opt to use the term "multilingual proficiency" to describe individual multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 53). Their doing so invites the consideration for the difference between (language) competence and proficiency, two terms that are sometimes used interchangeably in research.

Taylor (1988) explores the concept of competence as conceived by Chomsky, clearly showing that it confines itself to the internalised knowledge of a language, and not to its use or the ability to make use of it, as is evidenced in his citation of Chomsky, (1970 p. 184) "A person who has learned a language has acquired a system of rules that relate sound and meaning in a certain specific way. He has, in other words, acquired a certain competence that he puts to use in producing and understanding speech" (cit. in Taylor, 1998, p.149), thus clearly underlining that competence refers to linguistic knowledge. He posits that by having a clear understanding of what the term "competence" refers to, then:

> [W]e can draw a distinction between competence and proficiency, the latter term designating something like 'the ability to make use of competence'.

[46] Analysis of knowledge and control of processes discussed in 1.3.3.2.

> Performance is then what is done when proficiency is put to use. Competence can be regarded as a static concept, having to do with structure, state, or form, whereas proficiency is essentially a dynamic concept, having to do with process and function (1998, p. 166)

The term proficiency, on the other hand, has been used to refer to the learners' ability to go beyond the mere possession of language knowledge, to making use of it. It has, for example, been used in the assessment of learners' ability to engage their contextualized and decontextualized language skills in text production, based on the concept of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 1991). The proponents of DMM take this same line of thought in making a distinction between the two, by stating:

> [W]e must assume that 'knowing a language' includes the knowledge of a language and the knowledge of how to use the language. In our view it is the latter component which is of particular significance in multilingual proficiency and/or knowledge. In an attempt at a preliminary terminological clarification we would like to suggest that competence be restricted to the field encompassed by the knowledge of a language, whilst the term proficiency – primarily derived from SLA contexts – should be reserved for the consistent outcome of the speaker's knowledge of how to use a language and the knowledge of a language (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 56).

Multilingual proficiency, therefore, subsumes a multilingual's knowledge of languages and extends to cover their ability to make use of the knowledge of the languages they know. When talking of a multilingual's knowledge of languages, it must be remembered that the DMM is built on the basis of interacting language systems that create a unique multilingual system (cross-linguistic interaction). This interaction is manifested in a multilingual's language production, hence postulation that: "We must therefore assume that multilingual proficiency observes its own unique principles presented by factors unique to multilingualism" (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 57).

In addition to the interacting LS and the resulting Cross-linguistic interaction

(CLIN), a multilingual in the process of acquiring/learning multiple languages develops skills and abilities that are absent in a monolingual. These are referred to as the Multilingualism Factor (M-Factor), and include skills in language learning, maintenance and management, which all contribute to the development of the metalinguistic awareness (See also Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 129. Building on the wholistic approaches to bilingualism/multilingualism discussed above, the DMM takes a holistic angle, by factoring in all the elements making up the multilinguals's system in the definition of multilingual proficiency. It is, as Herdina and Jessner put it, "one mediating component between competence as implicit knowledge of a language and performance observed" (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 58).

Multilingual proficiency, therefore, takes into account the different LS that make up a multilingual's LS, the resulting CLIN and the M-factor, hence providing a holistic approach to a multilingual's language development (Aronin & Singleton, 2012, p. 89; Jessner, 2006, pp. 33–34). This holistic angle allows for the investigation of phenomena like cross-linguistic influence on specific LS, since any changes in the constituent language systems affects the entire system (similar to the butterfly effect discussed in 2.9.1 and 2.9.3).

2.9.3. The multilingual's system

As has been established, the DMM uses the dynamic systems metaphor to describe language and language development in a multilingual. This system is made up parameters that include cognitive capacity, language aptitude etc., and variable parameters e.g. LS, CLIN, perceived language competence, self-esteem, language anxiety, motivation etc. (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 88).

Dynamic systems, as has been discussed, are in state of constant change, and are characterized by complete interconnectedness and interaction of their composite parameters, which means that a change in one affects all the others, in what is referred to as "the butterfly effect" (See also De Bot et al., 2007, p. 8). This fluidity makes dynamic systems –like most ecological/biological systems- "discontinuous, inhomogeneous and irregular, that is turbulence, irregularity

and unpredictability are everywhere […]" (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 78). This means that the development of a dynamic system will not always be marked by clear-cut trajectories, as linear systems are, but rather ups and down, curves and complexities.

And this "chaotic" description, according to the DMM, fits a multilingual's language system. In accordance with other wholistic approaches to multilingualism (specifically bilingualism and multicompetence), the driving factor is the multilingual meeting their communicative needs in their sociolinguistic environment. As Jessner states:

> According to the DMM, the multilingual system is dynamic and adaptive. The multilingual system is accordingly characterized by continuous change and non-linear growth. As an adaptive system, it possess the property of elasticity, the ability to adapt to temporary changes in the systems environment, and plasticity, the ability to develop new systems properties in response to altered conditions (2008, p. 273)

What this means is that a multilingual's language system is made up of all the language systems that the individual knows (LS_1+ LS_2+LS_3etc. = MS (Multilingual System) (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 130; Jessner, 2006, p. 33). Its development is influenced by the interaction of the respective LS, the sociolinguistic environment the multilingual is in as well as the psychological and cognitive factors mentioned above. If an individual finds him/herself in an environment where the use of a particular LS is not needed, there is a high likelihood that the development of this particular LS will slow down or even stop altogether, as illustrated in 2.9.4 below.

2.9.4. The sociolinguistic factor in the development of a multilingual's system

DST sees foreign language learning[47] as a complex process in which many factors interact to influence a learner's foreign language development. This starts from

[47] This study expands the term "Second Language Acquisition" as used by De Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor (2007); Larsen-Freeman (1997) to include foreign language learning, since all these processes involve multiple languages and share a common goal of mastering additional languages.

the learner being part of a sociolingiuistic system in which the language learning is taking place, to the learner as a human being made up of complex systems, all of which play a role in (language) learning. As De Bot et al. (2007, p. 14) put it:

> A language learner is regarded as a dynamic subsystem within a social system with a great number of interacting internal dynamic sub-sub systems, which function within a multitude of other external dynamic systems. The learner has his/her own cognitive ecosystem consisting of intentionality, cognition, intelligence, motivation, aptitude, L1, L2 and so on. The cognitive ecosystem in turn is related to the degree of exposure to language, maturity, level of education, and so on, which in turn is related to the SOCIAL ECOSYSTEM, consisting of the environment with which the individual interacts.

Since all these factors are interconnected, change in any of them will have an effect on the whole system, due to what is referred to as the "butterfly effect" (See also De Bot et al., 2007; Larsen-Freeman, 1997). This effect causes observable changes in the developmental stages of target language mastery, referred to as "attractor states". One such attractor state is the interlanguage, which was used by Selinker (1972) to refer to the linguistic system that results from a learner's attempt at producing a structure in the target language.

Compared to a native speaker, the learner's interlanguage neither conforms to the conventions of nor has the fluency in the target language. It however points to the workings of a multilingual learner's mind, especially with regard to the interaction of the language systems making up the multilingual learner's linguistic system (cross-linguistic interaction). This cross-linguistic interaction causes instances of transfer, cross-linguistic influence, code switching, code mixing, borrowings etc. which influence the learner's production of not only the target language of the learner, but all the others that s/he knows. This, from a DST's point of view is evidence of the transient and dynamic nature of language and its acquisition/learning (See also Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Larsen-Freeman, 1997).

Due to cross-linguistic interaction and the resulting development of the

interlanguage, -also based on other factors like nature and duration of exposure to the target language, how different the target LS is from the other LS the learner possesses, age, cognitive, and sociopsychological tendencies of the learner etc. (See also Larsen-Freeman, 1997, p. 151) - a multilingual foreign language learner's target language production deviates from the linguistic and grammatical norm that a native speaker, more specifically a monolingual exhibits. As such, comparing multilingual competence to monolingual competence works against multilinguals, since phenomena like cross-linguistic influence and negative transfer inhibit fluency. Based on this, the DMM sets out to describe features of multilingual proficiency, independent of the monolingual comparison.

2.9.5. Consequences of interacting language systems for the multilingual foreign language learner

Although there are, as discussed, many variables interacting to create a multilingual's system, this study zeroes in on the interacting Language systems, and what this means for multilingual learners of foreign languages. The phenomena of cross-linguistic interaction and the resulting transfer and cross-linguistic influence are the most observable outcomes of the interacting LS in a language learner's production. In the following section, the DMM perspective is used to discuss these phenomena among Kenyan learners of German.

2.9.5.1. Cross-linguistic interaction and influence

In line with the dynamic systems theory, cross-linguistic interaction is understood to be caused by the interconnection of the individual linguistic systems in a multilingual's brain to create an entirely new multilingual system; it is therefore more of a blend, and not just an overlap (See also Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 27). The position taken by DMM is that "the presence of one or more language systems influences the development not only of the second language but also the development of the overall multilingual system" (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 28)

The first step towards understanding how this interaction is possible is anchored

in the physiological findings of how languages are stored and processed in the brain. In his paper, Paradis states that "all clinical evidence points to the fact both languages of bilinguals are subserved by the left hemisphere in the same proportion as in unilinguals" (Paradis, 1990), thereby dismissing the idea that L1 and L2 are attended to in different parts of the brain. More evidence of the brain processing different languages in the same areas is seen in (Crinion, 2006): "whole-brain functional neuroimaging studies have shown that highly proficient bilinguals activate the same set of brain regions irrespective of which language is presented or produced; These findings suggest that the neural circuits for different languages are highly overlapping and interconnected".

Dörnyei reinforces this position, by reiterating that that the L1 and L2 language processing has been observed to take place in the same areas of the brain (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 73). Furthermore, Cook's review of findings from various studies in multilingual language processing led to the conclusion that "the L1 and L2 share the same mental lexicon" (Cook, 1992, p. 566). This neurological evidence of languages occupying the same space areas in the brain adds weight to the claim of their interaction, interconnectedness, and interdependence, since it is natural tendency that organisms existing in a single space influence each other, and the DMM within the construct of the dynamic systems theory posits that languages are akin to living entities, hence the plausibility of their exhibiting live-like tendencies. The dynamics of the Kenyan sociolinguistic space mean that cross-linguistic influence would be commonplace. The following are some examples

2.9.5.2. Cross-linguistic interaction and influence: Evidence from the Kenyan sociolinguistic space

The multilingual constellation of the Kenyan sociolinguistic space is replete with evidence of cross-linguistic influence. Unsurprisingly, research has focused on the influence of Kenyan indigenous languages on English, being the most prestigious language taught in schools. One such study is "East African Englishes" (Schmied, 2008), which discussed the influence of indigenous languages in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania on English. His focus on East Africa is informed by

the presence of Kiswahili as the region's lingua franca, and he constructs that the East African English is largely influenced by the Bantu (Kiswahili) linguistic constructs at the phonological, lexical, grammatical as well as discourse levels.

Buregeya (2006) also connects some aspects on ungrammaticality of Kenyan English to the influence of Kiswahili and other Bantu languages, e.g. the positioning of prepositional phrases as well as dropping of direct objects (p. 210). In his conclusion, he posits that it might be time to accept the Kenyan English as a variety of English (p. 200). This has, however, not yet come to pass, and so these peculiarities are still marked as deviations. Some of them have been taken into account in the development of the empirical instruments for this study (Chapter 5).

Discussion on cross-linguistic influence in Kenya would be incomplete without mention of "shrubbing", which is described as the influence of Kenyan indigenous languages on the pronunciation of English and Kiswahili (Orcutt-Gachiri in Mendoza-Denton & Osborne, 2010). This phonological cross-linguistic influence of Kenyan languages English and Kiswahili is dependent of the L1 of the speakers. Schmied (2008), for example, observed that many Bantu speakers tend to mix up /l/ and /r/ as well as add or delete nasals (especially /n/ and /m/). This is because some Bantu languages e.g. Kikuyu do not have the /l/ consonant, and some consonant sounds are prenasalized. Speakers of these speakers align English (and Kiswahili) to their existing phonetic systems.[48] Shrubbing has largely been stigmatised, and is a source of shame, especially to young learners (Wairungu, 2014, p. 305).[49] In recent times, however, there is growing acceptance for Kenyan accented English, characterized by people taking ownership –and even pride- for their accents (See discussion in 1.3.4.)

[48] Agoya-Wotsuna (2012, pp. 137–147) while summarizing the phoneme system of the Kikuyu language, points out [l] does not exist in the language, and that the phoneme combinations <mb>, <nd> and <ng> are prenasalized as [ᵐb], [ⁿd] [ᵑg], such that the Kikuyu word for "maize" is written as <mbembe> but phonologically realized as [ᵐbɛːᵐb ɛ].

[49] When English and Kiswahili influence the indigenous languages, it is referred to as „twenging", and this is not looked down upon, since it is marks one is being more proficient in these prestige languages (See also discussion on language valorisation and identity (1.3.3).

2.9.5.3. Cross-linguistic influence on the German of Kenyan learners

This section reviews the findings of Agoya-Wotsuna (2012) and Hinga (2015), upon which the present study is built. Both these studies investigated the impact of Kenyan multilingualism on the learning of German as a foreign language in among Kenyan secondary school learners.

Agoya-Wotsuna's study takes a more general look at the general sociolinguistic situation as the background for learning German in Kenya, and focuses on phonetic-phonological, morphosyntactic, as well as lexical-semantic transfer of English, Kiswahili, Kikuyu, and Dholuo on the German of Kenyan secondary school learners. At the phonetic-phonological level, she attributes the learners' intonation and prosodic deviations in the German language to misplaced and prolonged pauses that are in line with the sound systems of their languages. Additionally, there is a discrepancy in the realization of some sounds in the German language, with some of them being aligned to English and/or Kiswahili realizations e.g. <v> as [v] (in Vater) (instead of [f]), <s> as [s] (in Universität) (instead of [z]), <z> as [z] (in Zebra) (instead of [ts]) (p. 144). At the morphosyntactic level, she observed the adherence to English structures: i.e. placement of the finite verb (e.g. no inversion after temporal adverbs), placing expressions of time at the end of the sentence (p. 213), aligning the articles and their use to the English rules (p.223). There are also phenomena that can be traced back to the influence of Kikuyu and Kiswahili e.g. the omission of direct objects (p. 228). Some of the errors identified at the lexical-semantic level point to a failed attempt at English-German translation ("ich bedeute" used in place of "ich meine", "deutlich" in place of "völlig" or "klar" pp. 272-273). There are also instances of direct translations of English phrases into German, e.g. "Das ist warum" instead of using the more appropriate "deswegen" p. 270). Others errors are caused by the confusion arising from words that have similar orthographic and/or phonological realizations (false friends) e.g. "bekommen" used to mean "become" (p. 274). The morphosyntactic and lexical-semantic deviations present the base of the empirical study.

In Hinga's (2015) study "The transfer of English competency into the written German of Kenyan form four learners: The case of negative transfer", she focuses on word order errors of the finite verb and establishes these are most prevalent in the conditional, followed by complement and casual subordinate clauses. Most of the errors observed involved the use of the causal conjunction "weil", which requires the placement of the finite verb in the last position, but which the learners realize as per the English structure (directly after the conjunction) (p.130). This informs the decision to include an item containing this error in the present study. She also discusses lexical and misspelling errors, establishing the most frequent one as involving the verb "bekommen" (p. 160); an item containing this error is also included in the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test.

2.10. Taking the metalinguistic approach to assess the awareness of multilinguality and cross-linguistic influence

The centrality of grammar in the teaching and learning of German as a foreign language in Kenyan secondary schools is indisputable, so is the confirmed presence of deviations in the German productions amongst Kenyan learners of German, which have been traced to the influence of their languages, especially English and Kiswahili. This study, therefore, in investigating the learners' awareness of cross-linguistic influence from English and Kiswahili on German takes the learners' knowledge of grammar as a component of metalinguistic development. This is based on the notion that metalinguistic knowledge is largely built on explicit instruction and explicit knowledge, and grammar is at the core of structured and formalised language learning (Ellis, 2001, 2004; Ellis et al., 2009; Ellis, 1993; 2008).

Taking the metalinguistic approach is informed by the notion of universality of metalinguistic knowledge, which means that this knowledge is transferrable across the languages that an individual knows. As Roehr-Brackin states in her introduction to the book *Metalinguistic Awareness and Second Language Acquisition*, "Metalinguistic knowledge is distinguished from linguistic knowledge by means of greater level of generality; metalinguistic knowledge is

considered broad and abstract in that it includes knowledge of general principles applicable to more than one language" (Roehr-Brackin, 2018, pp. 1–2). An example here is the knowledge of the parts of speech and their use in grammatical knowledge, e.g. an adjective will always be used to describe a noun, regardless of whichever language one is using. If a Kenyan learner of German already understands this function in one language (say Kiswahili), then they can easily transfer this knowledge onto German. On the other hand, if the learner lacks this knowledge, then s/he is disadvantaged in a form-focused foreign language teaching approach, as in the case of the Kenyan German lesson.[50]

To assess the metalinguistic knowledge and awareness of the learners, this study uses an Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Tests, even though Cook submits that that grammaticality judgements are unsuitable for experimental testing, "because the actual sensitivity to an L2 user will be different from a monolingual regardless of the actual state of the grammatical knowledge" (Cook, 1992, p. 564). This, he claims, is due to the fact that "research indicates that the multicompetent individual approaches language differently in terms of metalinguistic awareness" (Cook, 1992, p. 564.). This study however submits that grammaticality judgment tests still remain relevant as long as language teaching focuses on language as distinct entities, each with a distinct system and set of rules that a learner has to master to enable meaningful communication in that particular language.

The study's position is that the multilingual language learning awareness involves the understanding of the entanglement arising from the interaction and interwovenness of their many languages making up their multilingual system, and must include the ability to disentangle the languages, depending on the context in which they are to be used. This informs the two-pronged empirical approach taken in the subsequent chapters.

[50] See section 1.4.2.

2.11. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the theoretical frameworks guiding the study, showing how the aspects of the awareness of multilinguality and cross-linguistic influence tie to the broad concept of language awareness. It also expounds on how the study builds on the cognitive domain of language awareness as the basis for the investigation into the learners' perception of the interacting language systems of their dominant languages (English and Kiswahili) and the dynamics arising from adding the German language system to the multilingual system.

3. DEVELOPING AN ASSESSMENT OF THE AWARENESS OF MULTILINGUALITY

Introduction

This section delves into the conceptualisation of the open questionnaire, using the DMM's construct of interacting language systems discussed in the previous chapter to break it down into investigative and analytical units. The Qualitative content Analysis approach to the data analysis is also discussed.

3.1. Introducing the study participants

The study was conducted among 39 Form three Kenyan learners of German in four government/public secondary schools (n=39, mean age 16.67 years). All the learners had started learning German on joining secondary school in Form 1, (January 2014) and had had approximately 260 hours of German (3 lessons per week in forms one and two, 4 lessons per week in forms three and four, a lesson is 40 minutes). There is, therefore, an aspect of uniformity in the curriculum and teaching methodology of German as a foreign language, hence presenting a prototypical collection of "Kenyan learners of German".

The four schools are:

- The Starehe Boys' Centre: A boys' secondary school in Nairobi (11 participants)
- Precious Blood Riruta: A girls' secondary school in Nairobi (8 participants)
- Meru School: A boys' secondary school in Meru (7 participants)
- Kaaga Girls': A girls' secondary school in Meru (13 participants)

Data was collected during the 3rd school term of the 2016 school year. (September and October). All these are boarding schools, and since it was not possible to meet the students during the regular school hours, the questionnaire and the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test were administered either during the night prep (personal study time in the evening) or during the

weekend. Despite the unusual timings, the formality of the data correction was maintained by meeting in the respective schools' German rooms with the groups' teachers of German present.

3.2. Assessing the awareness of multilinguality: Why the open questionnaire?

A questionnaire containing open-response items was applied to establish the learners' awareness of their multilinguality and its role in language learning. This required the learners to take a self-reflective stance and examine what they know about the languages they know and how they affect and are affected by their learning of German as a foreign language. This elicitation, therefore, could be seen as part of introspective exercises, which have been described as "the process of observing and reflecting on one's thoughts, feelings, motives, reasoning processes, and mental states with a views to determining the ways in which these processes and states determine our behaviour" (Nunan, 1992 in McKay, 2009, p. 220).

Although elicitation of self-reflection data tends to be conducted using verbal protocols and other introspective methods such retrospective reports and interviews (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 147), this study opted for the written questionnaire after consideration of the following three factors:

1. To get a clearer picture of what Kenyan learners of German make of their multilinguality, it was important to include as many learners as possible in the study. Interviewing each one of the thirty-nine learners was however not a viable option due to logistical and time constraints. Using the open-response questionnaire allowed for the gathering comprehensive data from as many learners as possible (See Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 6).
2. The study participants were secondary school learners of ages 15-17, making them teenagers at the height of their adolescence. As Basset et al. found out, interviewing teenagers comes with its own set of challenges including non-responsiveness and/or giving mono-syllabic responses as

well as unwillingness to disclose personal information (Bassett, et.al. 2008, p. 123). They also noted that many teenagers tended to shy away from being recorded, despite their tech-savviness (Bassett et al. p. 122). Use of questionnaires gives them a chance to express themselves without the glare of attention that comes with speaking up. It also gives them some sense of autonomy, as they choose how much they want to disclose, and how they want to frame it.

3. The dynamics of teenagers-authority relationship, which was also observed to be inhibitive by Basset et.al. The same touchy relationship has been reported in Kenyan secondary schools, largely shaped by the role played by authority figures, especially teachers who are also discipline instillers (Kindiki, 2009; Kiprop, 2012). It is therefore conceivable that the researcher would be seen as an authority figure, leading to hesitancy in opening up in interviews. The students are however used to written exercises, hence the choice for questionnaires, as these do not require a face-to face interaction with authority.

With the questionnaire, therefore, the learners had ample time to reflect upon and self-report on their multilinguality and the role it plays in their learning of languages, albeit in written statements, and without the pressure of being in the spotlight, as it would have been in case of interviews. The choice for the questionnaire to elicit introspective data was further informed by Cohen's assertion that "[s]uch statements are usually based on beliefs or concepts that the learners have about the way that they learn language, and are often not based on the observation of any specific events" (1987, p. 84). The questionnaire sought information on the learners' beliefs about their languages in general. This freed the learners from having to focus on specific learning incidences, hence allowing them the freedom to draw a comprehensive connection between their multilinguality and their language learning process.

Open-response questions "are best suited for exploratory studies" (Brown, 2009, p. 201), hence the decision to use them for elicitation. These questions ensured that the learners have the freedom to explore and express their thoughts and

ideas without the inhibition of predetermined options, as would have been the case with closed-response questions.

3.3. Rationale for developing the questionnaire

Since the questionnaire aimed at getting the learners to reflect upon the interplay between their multilinguality and their language learning process, its development was based on the holistic approach taken the Dynamic model of Multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner, 2002), and discussed in detail in chapter 2. This approach gave rise to the concept of "the multilingual's system", which is characterised by the interaction, interconnectedness, and interdependence of all the languages (language systems) that a multilingual knows to create a dynamic system, giving rise to cross-linguistic interaction and cross-linguistic influence (section 2.8.3).

In addition, the questionnaire refers to the concept of (multilingual) language learning awareness (sections 2.5 and 2.6), which focuses on the learner's perception of their language learning behaviour. The learners are drawn into reflecting upon German language as a subject of study, and how they go about learning it, as well as making judgement as to how their knowledge of English and Kiswahili influences this process.

Combining these two allowed for the assessment of the learners' multilingual language learning awareness as:

1. Knowledge of one's multilingual system: Reflecting on the impact of English and Kiswahili on German and vice versa;
2. Critical engagement with the German language as a subject of study;
3. The learners' evaluation of their German language learning behaviour.

3.3.1. Knowledge of one's multilingual system: Reflecting on the impact of English and Kiswahili on German and vice versa

At a basic level, the interdependent character of the multilingual's system means that the language systems constituting it influence each other; and that change in one language system leads to a change in all the others (see the discussion on the

"butterfly effect" in 2.8.1, 2.8.3). This interdependent influence of languages on each other is at the core of this study, as it seeks to establish how well the learners can perceive the interaction, interdependence, and influence of English, Kiswahili, and German as part of their multilingual language learning awareness.

Kiswahili and English are taken as the most present and dominant language systems of the multilingual system of a Kenyan learner of German, following the findings of previous studies on multilingualism and the learning of German as a foreign language among Kenyan learners that established that cross-linguistic influence in German mostly stems from English and Kiswahili (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012; Hinga, 2015). This, by extension, also means that these two language systems would be most affected by the introduction of the German language system into the learner's overall multilingual system. This informed the study's choice to focus on the learners' awareness of their multilinguality as shaped by the interaction and interdependence of these three languages.

3.3.1.1. Assessing the awareness of the impact of Kiswahili and English on German

At this level, focus was on the positive impact of the knowledge of English and Kiswahili on the German language learning process, i.e. as resources the learners could draw upon to optimise and expedite their German language learning process. There is general consensus that prior language knowledge is beneficial in the learning of subsequent languages, as in the case of plurilingual and tertiary language didactics (Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009a; Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998; Hufeisen et al., 2004; G Neuner, 2010). However, even while Kenyan learners are already multilingual at the onset of learning German, and it is expected that the learners draw upon this knowledge as a resource, there is no evidence of what the learners know about their multilinguality, or even if they perceive it as a resource (or perhaps a hindrance) in the learning of German as a foreign language. This is especially in the light of the observation that the other languages the learner knows are not encouraged and/or allowed in the German lesson (See Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, p. 291). There is need, therefore to establish

what the learners know and make of their multilinguality and its role in learning German as a foreign language, hence the inclusion of the following questions:

- How does your knowledge of English help you in learning German? Please explain by giving examples
- How does your knowledge of Kiswahili help you in learning German? Please explain by giving examples".

3.3.1.2. Assessing the awareness of the impact of German on English and Kiswahili

Herdina and Jessner while discussing the transfer phenomenon in multilingual systems state that " language systems do not coexist without influencing each other" (2002, p. 28). In line with the interdependent character of the multilingual system, the influence of the language systems is reciprocal, meaning that it is not only English and Kiswahili that influence German, but also that the development of the German language system has effects on the existing English and Kiswahili language systems as part of the dynamic process.

The reciprocal influence of the languages making up a learner's multilingual system have been discussed under bidirectional transfer (Cheung et al., 2011; Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 66; Pavlenko & Scott, 2002). As Franceschini puts it, "there is also a need for specific investigation of how the acquisition of a third language (or fourth language) affects the languages already mastered by an individual. Initial results of research on third languages indicate that there are inter alia accelerating feedback effects" (Franceschini, 2009, p. 52). Based on this, the questionnaire got the learners reflecting on the effect learning German has on their English and Kiswahili, by asking the following questions:

- Has learning German helped improve your knowledge of English? Please explain;
- Has learning German helped improve your knowledge of Kiswahili? Please explain;
- Does learning German negatively affect your knowledge of English? Please explain;

- Does learning German negatively affect your knowledge of Kiswahili? Please explain.

3.3.2. Critical engagement with the German language

With its focus on study about language, Language Awareness promotes language as subject matter in its own right; and not only as a means of communication (Hawkins, 1984; James & Garrett, 1992). For this reason, this study postulates that the learners' ability to critically engage with the German language is a crucial aspect of their multilingual language learning awareness. Critical engagement is understood here as the learners' ability to work through the German language as subject matter to be learned; the leaners examine the aspects constituting the German language in a bid to discern how they work as well their learnability.[51]

One of the established theories of motivation (in foreign language learning) is that of self-efficacy, which "refers to people's judgement of their capabilities to carry out specific tasks […]"(Dörnyei, 1998, p. 119). It is conceivable that the Kenyan learners' perception of aspects of the German language as easy or difficult determines their belief of these aspects' learnability and/or unlearnability. The outcome is manifold:

(i) If the learner views an aspect as difficult, then they will doubt their ability to master it (low self-efficacy);
(ii) If the learner has difficulty mastering an aspect, they are likely to perceive it as difficult/unlearnable;
(iii) If the learner perceives an aspect as easy, then they will be confident in their ability to master it (high self-efficacy);
(iv) If the learner has ease mastering an aspect of the German language, they are likely to perceive it as easy.

Based on this, the questionnaire sought to establish the learners' perception of the learnability of the German language by including the following questions:

[51] The importance of exploration as the means to discover language hence enhance language awareness is discussed in details in section 2.1.

- What do you find particularly easy in learning German?
- What do you find particularly difficult in learning German?

The learners' responses to these questions establish the intervention points for the German language teachers so as to improve the learners' self-efficacy, since it adds a lot of value to the language learning process (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 21).

3.3.3. The learners' assessment of their German language learning behaviour

Closely tied to the learner's perception of the (un)learnability of the German language is the question of the methods and strategies they apply in their learning of German as a foreign language. This is important because language learning awareness entails the learner having an understanding of their language learning behaviour (detailed discussion under 2.5). Moreover, heightened language learning awareness is intricately tied to and is a prerequisite for autonomous learning, seeing that it is defined as "the ability to take charge of one's learning" (Holec, 1981 cit. in Little, 2007, p. 15).

To this end, the questionnaire sought to establish the methods and strategies the learners find most effective with the question:

- How best do you learn German? (What methods and strategies do you apply?)

The questionnaire also contained some fill-in items for the purpose of bio data items; these included the first name, the gender, age, and the name of the school. It also entailed a section on "language background", in which the learners were asked to list the languages they speak as well as state when they started learning English and Kiswahili. Also included in this section were two closed-response items requiring the learners to self-evaluate their reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills in both English and Kiswahili, as well as gauge their ability to explain grammatical rules in both languages.

3.4. Analysing the data from the questionnaire

This study chose a qualitative approach to the analysis of the elicited data. The choice for a qualitative approach was informed by its ability to get the "insider meaning" of phenomena, in the sense that "[q]ualitative research is concerned with the subjective opinions, experiences and feelings of individuals and thus the explicit goal of research is to explore the participants' view of the situation being studied" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 38). Since the questionnaire aimed at establishing what the learners know and think of their multilinguality and the dynamics it presents in their learning of German as a foreign language, this presented a suitable approach to get an "insider perspective".

By the foregoing, the study settled for the Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA), due to its in-depth and explorative approach to data. As Dörnyei puts it, "[…QCA] concerns a second-level, interpretive analysis of the underlying deeper meaning of the data" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 246).

3.5. Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA)

Content Analysis was initially conceptualised as quantitative approach to the high volume data generated from the media in the USA in the 1920s, providing for an analysis based on frequency, valence and intensity as well as contingency (Mayring in Flick, 1991, pp. 209–213). With time, however, the purely quantitative approach faced criticism for neglecting other factors in which phenomena is embedded. Consequently, the approach took a more qualitative turn, which allowed interpretation of the latent structures influencing phenomena (Mayring, 2010, p. 602).

The qualitative turn, however, did not mean the total abandonment of the quantitative basis of analysis, but was rather an expansion of the existing (quantitative) approach to allow for more in-depth interpretation and analysis of the data. It is for this reason that the QCA is regarded as a mixed methods approach (Mayring, 2014, p. 10). He further elaborates that:

> The central idea of Qualitative Content Analysis is to start from the methodological basis of Quantitative Content Analysis […] In this respect, the Qualitative Content analysis is a mixed methods approach: assignments of categories to text as qualitative step, working through many passages and analysis of frequencies of categories as quantitative steps (Mayring, 2014, p. 10).

One of the basic principles of QCA is that of "embedding of material in within the communicative context" (Mayring, 2014, p. 39), which underlies the importance of situating the data in the context from which it emanates, and taking this into account in the interpretation of the data. This involves considering the socio-cultural, emotional, cognitive, as well as motivational background that defines the data, hence the position that "the text is thus always interrelated within its context, i.e. the material is examined with regard to its origin and effect" (Mayring, 2014, p. 39). This principle allows the drawing of connections between the learners' statements and the sociolinguistic context of their upbringing and schooling, as well as the examination of how these relationships influence the learners' perception of their multilinguality in their learning of German as a foreign language.

Another aspect of QCA that informed the decision to apply it in this study is its adaptability and flexibility to fit every material and situation. As Mayring states, "Content analysis is not a standardized instruments that always remains the same; it must be fitted to suit the particular object or the material in question and constructed specially for the issue at hand" (2014, p. 39). This makes QCA appealing because one does not have to force the data into predefined straightjackets, but rather take the its systemic approach as a guide through the analysis procedure.

3.6. Preparing the data for the analysis

The study used the QCAmap; a software package for Qualitative Content Analysis (Mayring, 2018) to analyse the data. The QCAmap is an interactive web application offered via free access. Procedures and Instructions for its use are explained in the Social Sciences Open Access Repository's (SSOA) publication

Qualitative Content Analysis: theoretical Foundation, basic procedure and software solution (Mayring, 2014).

The learners' responses to the open-ended questions were all copied onto Ms. Word to enable a better overview of the data as well as for the convenience and flexibility in its processing. The learners' identities were codified for anonymity, with the learners being assigned a combination of their school initials and a number, i.e. KG1-KG13 for Kaaga Girls' High School, SB1-SB11 for Starehe Boys' Centre, MB1-MB7 for Meru School and PG1-PG8 for Precious Blood Riruta. The documents were then converted into Unicode (.txt) format and uploaded onto the QCAmap.

3.7. Coding the data: deductive and inductive categorization

As discussed, the questionnaire consists of questions anchored in the theoretical frameworks of multilingual systems and multilingual language learning awareness. Consequently, these questions made up the core categories of the analysis, similar to the approach of "deductive categorization" (Mayring, 2014) or "concept-driven categorization" (Schreier in Flick, 2014, pp. 170–183). Schreier describes the "concept-driven approach as "basing the categories on previous knowledge; a theory, prior research, everyday knowledge, logic, or an interview guide (p. 176). Each of these questions focuses on an aspect of the multilingual learning awareness.

The learners' responses to the questions making up the core categories give insight into the status of the multilingual language learning awareness. To this end, these responses were codified by the use of QCAmap. Through an inductive/ data-driven process of subsumption,[52] salient subcategories were defined based on their recurrent frequencies. The findings are presented and discussed in the following section (Chapter 4).

[52] "Subsumption" described as the process of categorization bundling-up material under overarching concepts (Schreier in Flick, 2014, p. 176)

3.8. Conclusion

This chapter discussed the conceptualisation of the open questionnaire as an empirical tool, tying it to the notion of multilinguality highlighted in the theoretical framework (chapter 2). This was achieved by breaking down multilinguality into the three main components that guided the investigation (3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3), and are the subject of the analysis presented in the next chapter. Also discussed was the Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) as the analytical approach.

4. AWARENESS OF MULTILINGUALITY AMONG KENYAN LEARNERS OF GERMAN

Introduction

In this section, the learners' responses to the questionnaire assessing their awareness of their multilinguality are presented and discussed. The objective of this discussion is to establish how the learners perceive their multilinguality, especially in the background of plurilingual didactics, which posit that mutilingual language learners build on their existing multlinguality as a resource to expedite their learning process.

This discussion takes the perspective of interacting and interdependent language systems to create a dynamic multilingual's system, as discussed in the context of the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner, 2002). In this holistic view of multilingualism, the language systems making up an individual's linguistic repertoire are constantly shifting in relation to the linguistic needs of the individual. Additionally, all these language systems influence each other regardless of when they were learnt and/or acquired (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 66), hence the presence of multidirectional transfer seen in the newly acquired language(s) influencing those learnt/acquired earlier. Consequently, when a multilingual uses a particular language code, it is likely to contain features of the other language systems making up his/her linguistic repertoire (cross-linguistic influence). In the context of language learning in the Kenyan schools, which requires the clear separation of languages into English, Kiswahili and German, the question is if the learners are aware of the tension between the natural inclination of interacting language systems and the required distinction of "pure" language entities taught and examined in schools.

Finally, focus is on the multilingual language learning awareness of Kenyan learners in the context of learning German as a foreign language. To establish the status of this awareness, issues pertaining to the learners' perception of the German language as subject matter; in line with the affective and cognitive

domains of language awareness (James & Garrett, 1992), as well as the learning strategies they consider most effective are discussed.

In this analysis, the statements from the learners are reproduced in cursive, in their original forms, regardless of the (grammatical) errors, misspellings etc.

4.1. Awareness of interacting language systems

As has been discussed, this study considers the awareness of one's dynamic multilingual system as a crucial aspect of the multilingual language learning awareness. The starting point is that a learner who knows and understands the interacting nature of his/her language system will be in better control of the resulting influence. For the Kenyan learner of German, the awareness of the inevitable influence of English and Kiswahili on German will guide them not only identify the debilitating outcomes of this interaction, but also the possible points of contacts that could serve to optimise the learning process. To this end, the questionnaire sought to establish the learners' awareness perception of:

- How and when the knowledge of English is a resource in learning German;
- How and when the knowledge of Kiswahili is a resource in learning German;
- How and when the knowledge of English inhibits the learning of German;
- How and when the knowledge of Kiswahili inhibits the learning of German.

In addition to the previously learned and acquired languages influencing the target language, it has been established that even the language being learned also influences the existing language systems. Moreover, even the first languages of multilinguals have shown evidence of having been influenced by the other languages they know (Cook, 2003), also chapter 2. Since this multi-directional influence is characteristic of a multilingual's interacting language system, awareness entails understanding this phenomenon: This study, therefore,

additionally sought to establish the learners' awareness in the context of German influencing English and Kiswahili.

4.1.1. Knowledge of English as a resource in learning German

The majority of Kenyan learners generally regard knowledge of English as potentially beneficial to learning German. The most referenced aspects are:

i) Psychotypology
ii) German-English-German translation
iii) Mediator language

4.1.1.1. Psychotypology

The concept of Psychotypology (Kellerman & Sharwood Smith, 1986) has been discussed by various researchers of multilingualism and language didactics, especially in connection to cross-linguistic influence and transfer, amongst them: (Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009a; Aronin & Singleton, 2012; Cenoz et al., 2001; De Angelis & Dewaele, 2011; Herdina & Jessner, 2002). It refers to the perceived distance between languages, which is definitive in whether the learner considers the already acquired/learned languages as potential resources in the learning of the target language or not.

54% of the participants' responses show that there is a perceived similarity in the grammatical concepts, the rules and structures in both German and English as evidenced in these sample statements that the learners gave in response to the question if and how the knowledge of English facilitates the learning of German:

- KG1: *I find that some of the things I learn in German are complemented in Englisch for example infinitives and imperative*
- PG1: *Some grammatical rules in English also apply in German making it easy*
- MB5: *I love English, I understand it very well, its structures and explanations and this has made it easy for me to understand the German*

structure and explanations when given in class or books e.g. subjects, verbs, clauses, direct speech, objects etc.

- SB11: *English is quite similar to German so it improves my learning of German*

This perceived closeness also extends to the vocabulary, with quite a number of responses (26%) referring to the fact that there are several words whose sound or appearance is similar in both languages:

- SB2: […] *many German words are similar to their English counterparts for example "garten" and "garden". Such words normally give us an idea of what the German words mean relative to their English counterparts*
- PG6: *Some English words are almost similar to some German words e.g kommen-come, waschen-wash*
- MB4: *Most of the words are almost similar to English e.g. Stuhl-stool, Klasse-class, Buch-book, Tur-door etc.*
- KG4: *In most of the rules and words in English are used in German as used in English, and if not most words can be related for example dass-that, mann-man, Mutter- mother*
- KG12: *Some of the words in English are retained in German. These are like Hobbys, Baby and Jeans. Also some of the words in English are pronounced the same like in German e.g Book and Buch*

4.1.1.2. German-English-German translation

Quite a number of learners (49%) find that translation to and from English is integral to their learning of German as a foreign language. Translation is used both at the word level as well as at the sentence level, and is mostly applied in the productive skills e.g.:

- PG2: *The fact that I know English enables me to make translations of words or sentences mentally from English to German and vice versa*

- KG2: *English helps me understand most German words. Once I translate an unfamiliar word to english, I can easily understand what it means because I have been using english for a longer time*
- SB6: *By writing sentences and expressing them in English then later translating them in German has really helped me and because of that I have come to understand some difficult phrases*
- SB1: *My knowledge of English comes in handy especially during composition writing. I am able to think of words suitable for writing then translate them in German*.
- PG4: *It helps in constructing sentences since I can write a complete sentence in English and translate it with the use of German rules e.g. I dream of going to shop- ich traume einzukaufen.*

It is also evident that this translation is enhanced by the availability of bilingual dictionaries offering equivalencies in English and German, and the learners report that they use them to check translation of words, spellings etc.:

- SB4: *The knowledge of English helps in learning german so that I can know translations of words in English to German. For instance when looking for a word in the dictionary and I don't know how it is spelt in german, I can look for the same word in English and see its translation*

Psychotypology is also a contributing factor to the use of translation, as the learners find that they can make the connections in the equivalences due to the similarities of the words:

- SB9: *Some translations from English to German become very easy and it is easy to figure out what a German word means by just looking for an English word that might be similar to it, e.g. Mutter means mother and Vater means father*

4.1.1.3. English as a mediator language

While the notions of psychotypology and German-English translation points to English playing the role of base language (Chandrasekhar, 1978) or

bridge/helper language (Marx & Hufeisen, 2007); both subsuming languages – whether first of successively learned - upon which learners build their learning of the target language by means of interlingual comparisons, English as a mediator language is seen to have a supportive function in the learning of German as a foreign language. In this function, the teachers use English to clarify the rules and concepts of German grammar and language:

- PG7: *During class, the teacher will explain concepts and rules in English so understanding English helps me know what the teacher is explaining.*
- PG2: *[…] sometimes in German lessons my teacher may use English.*
- SB8: *When I cannot understand a concept in German, it is further explained to me in English and I am able to fully comprehend the concept.*

While Agoya-Wotsuna's posited that other languages have no place in the Kenyan German lesson (2012, p. 291), this data shows that even if the teachers might not use comparative grammatical lessons in the German classroom, they still fall back on English as a medium for elaboration, and the learners themselves recognize that their knowledge of English offers some measure of facilitation to their German language learning process.

4.1.2. Knowledge of Kiswahili as a resource in learning German

Unlike English, Kiswahili is not regarded as much of a resource in the learning of German as a foreign language. Going by 44% of the responses to the question "how does your knowledge of Kiswahili help you in learning German?", it appears like there is a prevailing attitude of "Kiswahili cannot be helpful in the learning in German", hence the total suppression and rejection of any potential. Consequently, even if there were a chance that the knowledge of Kiswahili offered a point of connection, the learners would not even realize it, as seen in these responses:

- SB1: *My knowledge of Kiswahili does not help me in learning German. Kiswahili is not involved in the translating of German. The two languages are not interconnected in any way*

- MB2: *There is no interaction between how I learn German and Kiswahili*
- KG 13: *(…)Not at all. I don't like translating German to Kiswahili and I don't and I have never tried to understand German in Kiswahili*
- SB2: *My knowledge of Kiswahili doesn't really affect my learning German because the grammatical rules to be followed in Kiswahili and those followed in German speaking and writing are neither similar nor co-related*
- PG8: *It does not since I find no connections and if there are vey few*

The use of such strong and definitive phrases like *I don't, I have never, not interconnected in any way, it doesn't* etc. are evidence of the rejection and suppression of Kiswahili's potential in the learning of German as a foreign language. This could be tied to the fact that unlike English, it is considered a local/indigenous African language. For the learners, therefore, it might be inconceivable that an African language would facilitate the learning of a European language. While English is not a foreign language in Kenya, there is still the tendency to view it as exogenic, and this might trigger the "L2-perspective" (Williams & Hammarberg, 1998). Even though the L1, L2, L3 progression is hard to define given that Kenyans tend towards simultaneous multilingualism, the L2-perspective would come into play in that English is ascribed the non-native status,[53] while Kiswahili is native, hence the "desire to suppress L1 [in this case the endogenic Kiswahili] as being 'non-foreign', and to rely rather on an orientation towards a prior L2 [exogenic English] as a strategy to approach the L3 (Hammerberg in Cenoz et al., 2001, p. 37).

There are, however, some learners who see the potential benefits of knowing Kiswahili on their learning of German, in the aspects of:

i) Phonological similarities
ii) Kiswahili as a mediator language

4.1.2.1. Phonological similarities

A few learners (23%) recognize grammatical and phonological convergences between the two languages, with some pointing out that Kiswahili and German

[53] See the "Kizungu kilikuja kwa meli" discourse discussed in 1.3.4.

share the phonological feature of orthographic shallowness, e.g. SB5: *It only helps me in pronouncing German words since they are pronounced the same way as Kiswahili.* This makes it easier to voice and read German, since the phonemes and their combinations have a consistent phonetic realization, compared to English, which is classified as a deep orthography (Schmalz, et al., 2015).[54] It therefore makes more sense for the Kenyan learner of German to use Kiswahili as the means of orientation when reading German, because in both languages, <i> remains [i] or [I] regardless of the syllable composition.

The teachers also play a role in raising the awareness of this similarity, which could help the learners improve their pronunciation and reading skills:

MB5: *Kiswahili is not so much contributive but I can remember once my teacher told us German is like Kiswahili where you pronounce everything as it is e.g. Schule-German and shule-Kiswahili.*

However, seeing that only one learner made reference to the teachers' activation of Kiswahili as a resource in the learning of German could explain the learners' hesitance to see it as such, since the teachers are not active it highlighting the potential. As PG7 puts it, the fact that teachers use English as the mediator language makes it (English) a preferred resource compared to Kiswahili: *Kiswahili does not really assist me learn German since the lessons are taught I English and not many Kiswahili grammar rules are similar to German.*

4.1.2.2. Kiswahili as a mediator language

Kiswahili is also used for elaborative purposes. The difference with English is that while teachers fall back on English to explain the rules and concepts, learners use Kiswahili among themselves, as illustrated in 18% of the responses:

- SB10: *Kiswahili has made learning German quite easy. It is easier to explain some language rules in case someone has not understood in class by use of Kiswahili instead of English*

[54] English's deep orthography is highlighted by the various phonetic realizations of /oug/ in the running joke: "Although difficult, English can be understood through tough thorough thought, though" (Source unknown).

- KG12: *Whenever I cannot understand something in German, somebody explains it to me in Kiswahili*
- SB8: *If I don't know the meaning of a word in German, I ask for the meaning of the word in Kiswahili and then I am able to comprehend it*

As it seems, the clarifications in Kiswahili are most likely follow-ups of the teachers' explanations in both German and English (SB10's statement above). That the learners seek even further elaborations, this time in Kiswahili, could point to the reality of their true competence in English in relation to their perceived competence, and the tension surrounding the prestige languages in the Kenyan sociolinguistic space (Detailed discussion in 1.3.3.).

4.1.3. Knowledge of English inhibiting the learning of German

The learners' psychotypology of English and German is a key factor in their regard of English as resource in learning German. However, as has been discussed, the perceived closeness could lead to overgeneralizations, which lead to errors in the German language. It has been observed that less competent learners are easily influenced by phonological and orthographical similarities between languages (Haastrup, 1991, p. 55 cit. in Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, p. 302). This statement by KG7 on the English language as a resource in learning German reinforces this observation: *English sometimes helps to translate a sentence or word in German. Eg. Sympathetisch-sympathetic in English.*

The hesitation to take English as a resource in learning German seems entrenched in the fear of making errors arising from what the learners referred to as "direct translation". This shows an awareness of the differences in the two language systems (compared to the facilitative perceived similarities discussed in 4.1.1.). It also points to an awareness of the interacting language systems, which is faulted for the "confusion".

- KG8: *It sometimes doesn't help much because when dealing with the two languages it may get you totally confused like when goes to direct translation e.g Sympathisch is not to sympathise*

- MB2: *It hardy helps. Translating of some sentences sound like direct translation*
- KG10: *With my knowledge of English, I am able to connect German sentences though sometimes it doesn't help as direct translations are often misleading […]*

With such fears, these learners might be deterred from even trying to use their knowledge of English as a resource in learning German, since they try to supress the interaction of the languages to avoid any confusion. To counter this, sensitization measures should be put in place to equip the learners with the knowledge to enable them to benefit from the typological similarities between these two languages.

4.1.4. Knowledge of Kiswahili inhibiting the learning of German

Just as the knowledge of Kiswahili is not considered a resource in learning German, the learners do not imagine that it could impede the process. This perception, however, could not be further from the truth, seeing that it has been showed that multilingual systems exist as holistic units, and all the languages – consciously or subconsciously- are engaged in the learning process (Cook, 1992; Grosjean, 1985, 1989; Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998).

Given the widespread use of Kiswahili as the lingua franca among Kenyans, and going by the evidence that Kiswahili is the preferred mediator language among the learners, then it is inevitable that it influences the learning of foreign languages, whether it is intentionally applied or not. Chapter 6 presents further evidence of errors in German that can be traced to the influence of Kiswahili, some via English by the means of multileveled transfer.[55] There is need for the learners to be sensitized to this reality as part of their overall multilingual language learning awareness.

[55] Sections 6.2, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12.3

4.1.5. The influence of German on English

Within the context of multilingual language learning awareness, Muchira (2018) discussed the possibility of using the learning of German as a foreign language to develop a wholistic linguistic competency among Kenyan learners. She introduced the notion of turning the German lesson into a "lesson of languages" in which the learners would be encouraged to explore their languages following the taught concepts in/for German. In continuing this line of thought, the learners in this study were invited to reflect upon the possible ways in which learning German has improved their knowledge of English. The learners' responses highlighted improvement in the following aspects:

i. Improving explicit grammatical knowledge
ii. Expanding vocabulary

4.1.5.1. Improving explicit grammatical knowledge of English

Learning German was credited with improving the learners' knowledge of explicit grammar of English. 77% of the learners pointed out that they got to know and/or finally understand some grammatical concepts and their use in the English language only after learning them in German:

- KG3: *There were some parts of English grammar e.g. Akkusative that I knew noting about. Learning them in German arose my curiosity, and this resulted to ore research in the German language*
- SB5: *(…) it has at some point. For example, I didn't really know very well the Direct and indirect objects in English but on learning the akkusative and dative objects in German, I am well conversant with that knowledge.*
- MB4: *Most of the sections in English which I had not got them well I came to understand them better in German as the teacher tries to compare them to English e.g. Articles, Akkusative, Dative, Verb agreement, Punctuations*
- PG3: *German has helped me in learning my English grammar and gives a better understanding than I did before. When we learn the conjunctions, adjectives, nouns etc I am able to apply the same knowledge in English.*

The learners' sentiments point to a largely implicit-knowledge-driven learning of English (Ellis, 1994, 2008), which is conceivable, given that English is perennially present in the lives of learners from their childhood, and is for some learners the first acquired language. Learning German creates an opportunity to understand the grammatical concepts behind their knowledge of English, i.e. develop their knowledge about English; in line with the conceptualisations of Language Awareness as "implicit knowledge that has become explicit" (Levelt et al. 1978, p. 5 cit in James & Garrett, 1992, p. 18).

4.1.5.2. Expanding vocabulary

There is an indication that learning German helps expand the English vocabulary of Kenyan learners (23%), which is largely attributed to the English-German-English translation. A likely scenario in this case is that a learner uses a bilingual dictionary to check the English equivalence of a word she/he encounters in German, finds that they do not know what the word means, so they turn to their general English dictionary and/or thesaurus for its, definition, classification, pronunciation, use etc.:

- MB5: *Sometimes I've found meanings for some German words and had to go back to my English dictionary (Oxford) to search for its meaning and pronunciation*
- PG2: *When I have translated some German words to English before, I realise that I do not really know what some English words mean.*
- MB3: *When I learn new words in German, I usually relate it to English and find its synonyms*
- KG10: *Learning German words enriches my knowledge of English. This applies for example whereby, after learning a new german word, I'm able to understand its English meaning too*

4.1.5.3. Negative influence of German on English

There are instances when the growing knowledge of German is perceived as having negative effects on English. The cited instances include orthographic transfer, in cases where the German and English words have similar phonetic

and orthographic realizations, as KG2 stated: *It does, but not very much. For example some words in german are spelt almost the same way in english eg Music and Musik.*

One recurring observation in the learners' productions in both the questionnaire and the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test is the use of the German spelling of grammatical terminology. This has been attributed to the influence of German on English (MB1:*[…] In writing some words like Possesive, Dative, I find myself writing Possesiv, Dativ, Reflexiv*). The reason for this could be that since the learners are very attuned to the German spelling of these words –seeing that the English spelling is penalised in the writing exercises- they "forget" to turn this off when it comes to English, hence the mistakes. Furthermore, the learners also indicate that learning German sensitizes them to the grammatical concepts that they had not explicitly learnt in the English lessons, so their mental associations of these concepts is entrenched more in German than in English. This is further discussed in 6.12.2.

4.1.5.4. Resistance: German cannot affect English

Holistic theories of multilingualism underlying this study advance the notion of multi-directional influence of the language systems making up a multilingual's linguistic repertoire. Studies have shown evidence of this phenomenon, e.g. bidirectional transfer in the written productions of L1 Russian users of L2 English (Pavlenko & Scott, 2002) and grammatical transfer from L3 German to L2 English among L1 Cantonese speakers (Cheung et al., 2011) etc. Some Kenyan learners of German, however, are convinced that this is an impossibility simply because they have been learning English longer than they have German, as seen in the responses given by 21% of the learners:

- B4: *My learning German has not helped me improve my knowledge in English. This is because I know more English than German since I started learning German in 2014 while English in 2006*
- MB7: *No. Because I already had a lot more knowledge of English*

- PG4: […] *This is because I know more of English therefore I would tend to improve on German with the use of English by getting new vocabularies.*

In their conviction that learning German can in no way influence English, just because it is learned later in life, these learners are developing a mental conditioning that locks out any positive influence like such discussed above (4.1.5.1, 4.1.5.2).

4.1.6. The influence of German on Kiswahili

In line with the notion of developing the learners' multilingual proficiency and competence discussed in 4.1.5, it is evident that Kiswahili is completely locked out the learners' German learning experience. The prevailing position is that there is no interaction between the two languages (See learner statements in 4.1.2). Consequently, there is the conviction that knowledge of Kiswahili is neither beneficial to the German learning process (responses from 59% of the learners), nor can it be affected by the newly gained knowledge of German (responses from 72% of the learners).

With this viewpoint, the learners miss out on the benefits of plurilingual didactics; every language that the learner knows at the onset of learning another has got something to offer to the learning process, and at the same time, every language that the learner already knows stands to gain from the learning of a new language, as foreseen in the development of multilingual proficiency (Herdina & Jessner, 2002). There is need, therefore, for the learners to be sensitized to the fact that all their language systems are in constant interaction with each other, so that they work on learning how to harness and control this interaction.

4.2. Engagement with the German language as subject matter: Perception of learnability

The language awareness' view of language(s) as rightful subject matter calls for the exploratory approach to language, so as to allow learners to develop a more

analytical knowledge of language (Tinkel in James & Garrett, 1992, pp. 100–106). With this in mind, therefore, this study sought to establish how the participants perceive the German language as a subject of study, by having them reflect on and evaluate the language in terms of their ease and difficulty. The understanding is that their perception of the content as easy or difficult determines their choice of learning methods and strategies, and contributes to the learners owning their learning process as part of developing their overall language learning awareness (Neuner in Hufeisen et al., 2004, pp. 21–22).

4.2.1. Aspects of the German language perceived as "easy"

The following featured predominantly in the learners' responses to the question "what do you find particularly easy in learning German?"

i) Reading
ii) Grammar
iii) Vocabulary

4.2.1.1. Reading

Reading is a receptive skill, which means that it is aimed at enabling the understanding of the content in a text (Davies, 1976, p. 441). The publication "Fertigkeit Lesen",[56] states that the goal of teaching reading skills in the foreign languages is to equip the learners with the ability to independently meet their needs for information contained in foreign language texts (Westhoff, 2001, p. 7).[57] The emphasis of comprehension as component and goal of reading skills is therefore thoroughly entrenched in the teaching of languages, hence its reference as "reading comprehension" in language didactics. While quite a number of learners (28%) state that they find reading in German easy, further interrogation of the responses reveal that there are different varieties of reading skills present among these learners.

[56] Previously used in the teacher training programs of the Goethe-Institut.
[57] Original German, translation by author.

One such variety does not necessarily fit the concept of reading comprehension or reading to understand, but is rather based on the ability to recognize and pronounce words in German, as PG4 states: *I find reading quire easy in German. This is because I find it easier to pronounce words in German*. This connects to the shallow orthography discussed above (4.1.2.1.), in which leaners exhibit a phonemic awareness (they are aware of the consistent phoneme-grapheme correspondence in German, just like in Kiswahili). It means that in cases of reading out loud, the learners are able to voice/articulate new words, even if they do not comprehend their meaning. KG2's explanation further reinforces this: *The easiest part for me in learning german is reading german. I can easily read German texts but it takes long for me to understand.*

The other variety involves the application of resources to facilitate comprehension, as expressed by PG2: *Reading. Because I can easily use a dictionary*. The availability of dictionaries is clearly an empowerment for the leaners who seek to comprehend text in the German language. In addition to the material resources, some learners connect the ease of reading to the availability of rules and strategies that they use to promote comprehension, e.g. SB9: *Reading of texts and stories are very easy to read and interpret once one knows the rules in reading*, PG3: *I find it easy to put two things together or to relate and connect the dots when reading sentences.* This also indicates a deliberate fall-back on explicit instruction imparted in the context of form-focused learning, as advanced in 1.4.2

These two varieties fall in the categories of active and passive reading identified by Dostert (1955). These two, as he discusses, are largely driven by the learners' motivation and objective; with some eager to achieve an active reading skill that will enable them actively use the foreign language, while the others only seek a passive skill that is enough to facilitate recognition of the symbols (Dostert, 1955, pp. 128-129). These passive and active constructs tie to the examination factor, whose looming presence seems to permeate every perception and behaviour of the learners. In the case of the passive readers -whose ease of reading is defined simply by the ability to recognize and the words without

necessarily understanding their meaning-, the "easy perception" could be tied to the fact that they score highly in reading-out-loud tests/exams, regardless of their lack of comprehension. This highlights the examination factor in the learners' engagement with the German language

4.2.1.2. Grammar

Going by 33% of the responses to the question "what do you find particularly easy in learning German?", German grammar is singled out as an "easy to learn" aspect of the language, a perception that is evidentially attributed to the presence of rules that offer guidance in their application:

- SB4: *What I find easy in learning German is the verb conjugation, reading comprehension. It is also easy doing grammar.*
- PG5: *I like that the rules are easy to follow and help me in my sentence construction*
- PG6: *The rules to be followed are particularly easy for me to understand and remember*
- MB5: *The German rules are easy once know, for they are not very demanding or complicated.*
- PG7: *I like the rules and structure of the language and when writing I only have to apply the same rules I have been taught in class.*

This shows a conscious application of explicit grammar rules in the learning of German, which reinforces the thesis that the implicit German knowledge of these learners builds on the explicit knowledge taught in the classroom and presented as explicit grammatical rules.[58]

As was suggested in 4.2.1.1, the perception of ease and difficulty is tied to the examination, and in the case of grammar, it is regarded as easy because of the ability to recall and apply the rules during examination, as SB6 states *Grammar. Because it is quite simple and easy to apply during examinations such as modal*

[58] On the explicit-implicit knowledge interface question, it was posited that the Kenyan learners of German would lean more towards the strong-interface position in section due to the didactic and curricular context the learning takes place in. (Discussed in 1.2.2.4.)

verbs. As a result, all learning activities geared towards creating and using pattern-drills and other mnemonic devices are associated with the easy aspects of the German language, and classified as such:

- KG11: […] *At least I remember most of what I learnt by making short songs about it. It's easy*.
- KG8: *It practically fun hence improving the understanding capacity like when (we) play the spinning wheel for verbs*

This also shows that the learners do not necessarily separate the content to be learned from the learning process; further reinforcing the argument that learners base their conclusion of ease/difficultly on the learnability of the aspects (3.3.2).

4.2.1.3. Vocabulary

Tied to the perceived closeness of German and English (psychotypology) discussed above (4.1.1.1), learning the German vocabulary is regarded as easy, going by 21% of the responses. Learners are able to draw the meaning of words in German from similar words in English e.g. MB5: *So many English words are closely related to German words.* The English-German translation also plays a role in this, given that as already discussed, the learners use English-German dictionaries. The access and availability of these dictionaries make it easy for the learners to quickly find out what the German equivalent of an English word is, as MB7 states: […] *that one can translate some words from German to English and understand it easily.*

4.2.2. Aspects of the German language perceived as "difficult"

Kenyan learners regard the following aspects of the German language as "difficult":

i. The articles
ii. The grammatical rules and sentence construction
iii. Listening

4.2.2.1. The articles

That the learners perceive the mastery of articles as difficult is not surprising (41% of the responses), given that there is a marked difference in the noun classification in English and Kiswahili, their dominant languages and German. While English follows the "natural gender" of males, females and things (Durrell & Hammer, 2002, p. 1), Kiswahili has eighteen classes of nouns defined by their concordial markers (Mohamed, 2001, pp. 40–58). German, on the other hand, has a seemingly arbitrary method of classification, in which all nouns regardless of their state of being living or non-living fall into either the feminine, masculine, or neuter classes. Although there are attempts to guide learners of German as a foreign language in possible classification criteria, quite a number of nouns fall outside these "rules", hence the advice to just learn the article with the noun (Durrell & Hammer, 2002) or memorize the articles and their various declensions (Eckhard-Black & Whittle, 1992, p. 11).

Seeing that the Kenyan learners have shown a strong penchant for rules because they offer directions for grammatical constructions (4.2.1.2), it is conceivable that a phenomenon that is not clearly defined by rules is frustrating for them, as evidenced in their expressions:

- KG9*: I find the mastering of the various artikels hard, for example determining whether a certain word is feminine, masculine or neutral*
- *KG5: Learning artikels could be hard. In an exam, your answer might require knowledge of the article of a word which you have not come across yet. Here, all you can do is guess. The issue is there is hardly a rule on which words take the neutral, female or male genders.*
- *SB4: The sentence structures in german and the articles of nouns. It is hard to make out which nouns are feminine, maskuline or neutral (die, der, das)*
- *PG5: Mastery of nouns, their articles and plurals has been quite a task. There are always so many new*

The learners are aware that the gender of the nouns determines their use in the consequent grammatical constructions, and they cite the difficulty of mastering the articles as an impediment to their performance:

- KG2: *I would say that the most difficult thing for me in learning German is getting to know the articles of nouns. It takes me a long time to put them in a sentence in a grammatically correct manner (I can put them correctly, but it takes time because I have to follow the rules especially about the articles)*
- KG8: *[...]Sometimes when it comes to gender of all things even the unliving and dealing with the Akkusativ and Dativ it may be confusing*
- *KG11: Like almost every German word has its own article. Then there's how and what you're supposed to put together to form a sensible sentence. It gets confusing at times.*

The learners' awareness of the noun classifications in English and Kiswahili and how they differ from the articles in the German language is detailed in their explanations of the grammatical errors in 6.5 and 6.6.

4.2.2.2. Grammatical rules and sentence structure

While the grammatical rules that are easily turned into memorizable patterns are considered easy (4.2.1.2), learners perceive the grammatical constructions in the German language as containing too many rules; 46% of the responses use words like "complex", and "confusing" to describe the grammatical rules, and point out that there are many exceptions. The learners also draw comparisons to the more familiar English, and reflect on their "beginner status" as the probable cause of this difficulty:

- MB7: *Some grammar rule are confusing unlike the ones in English*
- KG4: *The exception rules that are confusing in some formula used*
- PG4: *Sentence construction. This is because I am new (kinda) to it and its rules are not as English rules*
- SB1: *Sentence structure. German language has a complex sentence structure that is often easier than not confuse and mix up words*

- SB2: *I find it particularly difficult to learn sentence structure. German has a lot of grammatical rules that are at times particularly confusing to grasp-. The grammar rules are also very hard to understand; most of them*

The rules are considered more difficult in case of free conversations, which is conceivable seeing that speech is spontaneous and does not allow much time for consulting the underlying grammatical knowledge. It echoes the postulation that explicit grammatical knowledge is not accessible for spontaneous speech practices (See Paradis, 1994, p. 399), and that time –and its availability- is decisive factor in the use of explicit grammatical knowledge as a resource in conversations (See Bialystok, 1979) . It is evident that the perceived difficulty of grammatical sentence construction inhibits the learners' ability to use them, and also points to a correlation between metalinguistic knowledge and performance, seeing that learners reflect upon and attribute their inability to perform on the non-mastery of explicit grammatical knowledge:

- KG6: *It is a bit difficult to finish a whole conversation since it has many rules that have to be considered before making a sentence that is grammatically correct.*
- SB10: *The grammatical rules are quite difficult to apply especially in speech*
- KG13: *Sentence structures and some German language rules when speaking e.g. when speaking when I have to say something in dativ or akkusativ.*
- SB9: *[…] When speaking, one has to think a lot before speaking.*

4.2.2.3. Listening

While reading is regarded as easy, learners regard the other receptive skill –listening- as difficult, possibly because it is impossible to divorce listening from comprehension, as is the case with passive reading. This is especially true for the examination context, whose performance the learners' perception of the German language is evidently entangled.

That these learners perceive listening as difficult is consistent with findings in the research into the development of the various skills in second and foreign

languages, in which it has been established that "listening is often perceived by language learners as the most difficult language skill to learn" (Vandergrift, 2007, p. 191). This has been attributed to among others the limited linguistic skills of the (beginner) learners, which slows down the rate at which the aural input is processed. It has already been established that these learners are reflective of how their limited grammatical skills in the German language affect their proficiency (4.2.2.2)

The learners, consequently, "need to consciously focus on what they are listening to, and a large proportion of what they hear may be lost, given the speed of speech and the inability of the working memory to process all the information within the time limitations" (Vandergrift, 2007, p.193). This is reflected in the learners' statements, in which the speakers' speed of speech is singled out as the cause of the difficulty:

- KG1: *Hören wenn man schnell spricht*[59]
- SB8: *When I have to listen to texts or conversations especially between native Germans, I find it very difficult to comprehend*
- MB1: *Understanding someone speaking fluent German*

Another factor determining the development of the listening skills is the ability of the learners to make use of the metacognitive strategies of selective listening and directed attention. This enables them sift through the superfluous input to identify what is needed for the fulfilment of the present communicative need (Dahlhaus, 2007, p. 79; O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989; Vandergrift, 2007). It is evident that these skills need grooming, since this has been singled out as a source of difficulty, as SB3 describes the exercise of listening: *I find the listening part particularly difficult in learning German because the speaker on the radio or audio quite uses a lot of irrelevant information which sets you off the answer.*

Given that "listening is the primary vehicle by which a person acquires an L2 [and any other language, for that matter]" (Rost, 2006, p. 48), it is crucial that the

[59] Translation: Listening when one speaks fast

teachers of German in Kenyan secondary schools intervene and find ways to help the learners groom their listening skills.

4.3. Multilingual language learning strategies

As discussed in 3.2.3 and 3.2.3, the learners' perception of the German language as subject matter by determining the learnability of its various aspects culminates at establishing the learning strategies the learners apply to optimise their learning experience. This is conceptualised as an aspect of learning awareness, which is described as the learners' sensitivity to their learning behaviour and experience (Neuner in Hufeisen et al., 2004, pp. 13–34).

Strategies in language learning are defined as "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferrable to new situations" (Oxford, 2006, p. 8). Taking actions implies that learning strategies is a conscious move (Cohen, 1998), hence tying them to language learning awareness. In this section, therefore, the learners' reflections on how best they learn the German language are discussed based on their responses, and include:

i. Teacher input
ii. Practicing strategies: Homework assignments and reading as naturalistic practice
iii. Social strategy: Seeking out partners

4.3.1. Teacher input

The teacher of German is at the core of learning German in Kenyan secondary schools. It is evident that everything the learner learns is built upon the teachers' input, as expressed by SB1: *I best learn german from my teacher who gives me 70% of the content. The remaining 30% I gain from reading the german dictionary and speaking with my classmates*. The teacher in a progressive language classroom plays the role of "facilitator, helper, guide, adviser, coordinator, idea person, diagnostician, and co-communicator" (Oxford, 2006, p. 10). In addition to these functions, the teacher is also regarded as the authority in matters German:

- KG11: *Speaking and writing all I think of in German, having corrections made where I have gone wrong, and accepting the correction […]*
- MB4: *Listening and following my teacher's instructions.*
- SB4: *By discussing with my fellow students and having the teacher clarify where difficulties arise.*

The role of the teacher is connected to the centrality of the German lesson. This is seen in the learners' constant reference to the classroom and that the taught content forms the basis for further revision and practice of the German language:

- KG12: *Once the teacher has taught a concept in class, I always try to remind myself.*
- MB4: *Listening and following my teacher's instructions, regular revision of every value added in each German lesson*
- B6: *Using German books, listening and taking part in the lesson when we are being taught Speaking German with my colleagues during our free time.*
- SB7: *I learn German in class with my teacher.*

The fact that learning German as a foreign language in Kenya is still somewhat of a rarity[60] explains the overreliance on the teachers and the German lesson. The schools involved in the study are boarding schools (like most of Kenyan secondary schools). The learners are confined to the school for the duration of the school term, and can only work with the course material. Availability of additional material is limited, since books in the German language are not available in the local market (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, p. 293).

Additionally, the boarding school structure means that the interaction circle is limited to one's school- and classmates and teachers.[61] The learners are quite aware of this fact, going by MB5's assertion: *There are few schools, stations or institutions for German currently in the country. Remedial classes out of school are*

[60] See statistics in 1.4
- See also the uniqueness-factor as motivation for learning German in an environment where very few speak it (1.4.1)

[61] There is the Kenya Music Festival, and the German Cultural festival; annual events where learners recite and present poems, skits, songs etc. in the German language. Apart from these, there are few opportunities for learners from different secondary schools to interact

few and expensive. Materials and facilitators for German are few. This leads to, as MB3 states, a feeling of *[…] not having enough exposure to the language*.

The learners' sentiments point to their awareness of the complex – and to an extent limiting -circumstances in which they learn the German language, and that this has impeding effects on their progress. Those who can try and improve the situation, e.g. *By going to the Goethe Institut for a short term German course during the holidays* (PG8),[62] but this is a move that is dependent on one's financial capabilities (it is quite expensive, as mentioned by MB5 above), and other logistical factors tied to the Goethe-Institut Kenya being situated only in Nairobi.

4.3.2. Practicing

"Practicing" is classified under cognitive strategies, which are strategies that involve the "manipulation or transformation of the target language by the learner (Oxford, 2006, p. 43). With this manipulation, the learners attempt to gain better control of the content they learn. The practicing construct encompasses 5 strategies, as discussed by Oxford (2006, pp. 44-45):

- Repeating
- Formally practicing with sounds and writing systems
- Recognizing and using formulas and patters
- Recombining
- Practicing naturalistically

Going by the reflections of the learners, the strategies of repeating and practicing naturalistically are the most prevalent.

Repeating is defined as "saying or doing something over and over, listening to something several times; rehearsing, imitating a native speaker" (Oxford, 2006, p.45). It is evident in the learners' reference to revision of the taught content working by doing their homework assignments.

[62] The Goethe-Institut offers "Courses for children and young people" during the school holidays of April, August and December('Courses for children and young people—Goethe-Institut Kenia', 2018) (Access 04.12.2018 1941hrs CET)

Naturalistic practice on the other hand is defined as "practicing the language in natural, realistic settings, as in participating in a conversation, reading a book or an article, listening to a lecture, or writing a letter in the new language" (Oxford, 2006, p. 45). In this case, it is seen in the learners' reference to reading German storybooks, articles, magazines etc. as their preferred way of learning the German language.

4.3.2.1. Homework assignments help in the mastery of grammar

As mentioned above, practice and revision are aimed at deepening the comprehension of the content taught in the classroom. What is also evident is that the learners value the given assignments since they provide further direction in their revision; which could be seen as further reliance on the teachers' guidance, since it is she/he who gives the assignments.[63]

- KG1: *I revise grammar by doing assignments and learning as many words as possible*
- KG8: *By doing exercises given in class alone without asking to test my understanding ability. Redoing or rereading the notes and exercises*

These statements show that homework assignments, for these learners, serve the function of reviewing the material presented in class, in line with the defined purposes of homework (Cooper et al., 2006, p. 1). Additionally, learners supplement the taught content by seeking additional input, as KG12 states*: […] Also I use revision books like Klipp und Klar to go through what we have been taught.*

It should not be taken for granted that learners exhibit a positive attitude towards homework assignments and embrace them as a learning opportunity, since research has established that this is not always the case, e.g. in Kohn

[63] While homework has been described as learner-centred, since it "takes place without concomittant teacher direction" (Hong, 2004, p. 198), the teacher's role in determining what is to be done cannot be ignored; especially since there are instances of checking that the assignment is (satisfactorily) done. This implies that the teacher still retains an omnipresent kind of influence over the homework.

(2006a, 2006b).[64] Of main interest here, however, are the studies establishing that homework assignments have positive effects, e.g. Carr (2013) and Vatterott (2010) discuss the factors that increase homework's effectiveness, among them purpose, efficiency, ownership, competence and aesthetic appeal. The challenge here is for the Kenyan teachers of German to ensure that the homework assignments do not lose their appeal among their learners.

4.3.2.2. Reading German content as naturalistic practice

Reading texts that are not developed for didactic purposes is classified as one way of practicing naturalistically (Oxford, 2006, p. 76). It is encouraged because learners get a chance to explore and familiarize themselves with authentic language use. Given that the Kenyan learners perceive "reading" an easy aspect of the German language, it is not surprising that it also features as one of their preferred strategies for learning the German language.

The reading material ranges from novels to storybooks to textbooks to magazines, and even comics, as evidenced by the learners' statements:

- KG1: *I read articles and storybooks.*
- KG2**:** *[…] reading German texts, stories, magazines, […]*
- KG5: *[…] I read storybooks […]*
- MB2: *Reading storybooks*
- MB1: *[…] reading magazines*
- SB2: *[…] reading German texts.*
- SB11: *I learn German best when I am exposed or I expose myself to many German articles and mostly when I read comics written in German*
- PG2**:** *I take German in school where we are exposed to the German language through reading German novels, articles, […]*

[64] Kohn's arguments are largely from the parent's perspectives on the negative effects of homework on their children and its encroachment on family time. He however also addresses the matter of the pressure homework assignments put on children, and how this turn even the most enjoyable exercise into a loathsome burden. This would apply also to learners in boarding school contexts who have to deal with days full of instructional time, and then have to deal with the homework assignment in the non-instructional time.

The active-passive constructs of reading (discussed in 4.2.1.1.) persist, with the passive learners admitting that they read texts in German even if they do not understand the content: MB5I *read anything and everything concerning German I come across. I love to pick up articles or books related to German and store them even when they are beyond my comprehension.* The active learners on the other hand take reading as a chance to build up on their knowledge e.g. SB6: I *read German textbooks and when I come across a word or verb I don't know, I look it up and also research on the various changes the verb or word takes in different situations. I write them down on my notebook. I read my notebook on alternating nights before I go to sleep.*

It is highly likely that the boarding school structure propagates the reading culture over the other naturalistic practice strategies, due to the so-called "prep time". This is non-instructional time set aside for the learners' private study.[65] Since learners sit in their classrooms or the library, it is expected that silence is maintained, and this rules out any exercises that involve making sounds, like speaking or listening. This structure therefore favours "silent" exercises like silent reading.

Another factor is the practicality of print media over others e.g. audio and video media. In many schools, the infrastructure and machinery used with audio and video media is stored in the German room, and can be used only under the teachers' guidance. Since "prep time" takes place outside the teachers' working hours, the learners have no access to it. The print media, however, requires no further technology, which makes it convenient for the learners to use it in their own time.

Improving the practice of reading among the learners

While it is important to promote other strategies of practicing naturalistically e.g. listening, participating in conversations, etc., it is also evident that the boarding school context comes with its own dynamics, which make reading a fitting –

[65] The regular practice in many boarding schools is to have "prep time" early in the morning before the teaching timetable commences, and late in the evening after – dinner, before bedtime. This is the time when learners also do their homework assignments.

hence- preferred practice. The following measures would optimise this practice in the Kenyan schools:

i. Provide the learners with adequate and fitting reading material that is relevant to their age, living and learning environment, interests etc. (Neuner in Hufeisen et al., 2004, p. 27; Muchira, 2018, pp. 131–132).[66] In this, the teachers and schools must be more proactive in sourcing the material for their learners, since books in the German language are not readily available on the Kenyan market (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, p. 293).

ii. Train the learners on effective reading skills and strategies in order promote active reading. Reading is a skill to be learned (hence also taught), since as Grabe puts it, "reading is not an inherently natural process in the same way that speaking and listening are in a first language (L1)" (Grabe, 2006, p. 279). The learners should be enlightened on the different types of reading; selective, extensive, perceptive, interactive etc., as well as the various approaches to it; skimming, scanning etc.

iii. Much as the reading takes place in the learners' free time, the teacher could offer guidance by "giving them [learners] active and interesting reading tasks" (Oxford, 2006, p. 76). This way, the learners will approach the texts with set goals and objectives, instead of diving in aimlessly. They (the learners) are also reassured of the support of their teachers. The trick here is to maintain a healthy balance so that the learners do not feel forced or obliged to work on the tasks (which can easily happen when the teacher intervenes), but rather motivated to read and learn. The end goal, is to develop intrinsic motivation for reading (Grabe, 2006, p. 292)

iv. Train the teachers on imparting reading skills as well as fostering effective reading habits among their learners, seeing that it has been established that teaching of reading is not easy task, due to the many

[66] The shortage of reading material in the German language in Kenyan schools has also been highlighted in Agoya-Wotsuna (2012).

factors involved and considerations to be made e.g. language and classroom constellations, available resources, curricular requirements etc. (Grabe, 2006, pp. 279–290). Since the Goethe-Institut Kenya organises training sessions for secondary school teachers,[67] this would be an opportunity to engage the teachers and sensitise them on their role in promoting reading as a naturalistic practice among their learners.

4.3.3. Social strategies: Seeking out partners

Oxford (2006) gives "cooperating with peers" and "cooperating with proficient users of the new language" as some of the social strategies effective in language learning. The Kenyan learners of German engage in these strategies by practicing their speaking skills with each other, as seen in their responses:

- KG9: *[…] Talking in German with my friends […]*
- MB1: *Speaking with fellow students […]*
- MB4: *By communicating in German when with my fellow German friends.*
- SB1: *[…] speaking with my classmates.*
- SB6: *[…] Speaking German with my colleagues during our free time*
- PG6: *I have a friend (Deutsch buddy) in school, we decide to spare some minutes or an hour of our day and we talk to each other in Deutsch. We choose a certain theme and talk about the theme in German.*

In addition to practicing their language skills, holding conversations in German also serves to reinforce the "unique factor", by setting themselves apart as users of a language that only a select few have a command of. This is line with the affective and integrative domain of motivation discussed in 1.4.1.

Further nexus between the learners' strategies and motivation is evident in the roping in of family and friends in the learning process, in line with the motivation dimension of "significant other" (1.4.1). An example is seen in KG11's statement:

[67] ('Professional development in Kenya—Goethe-Institut Kenia', 2018) (Accessed 08.12.2018, 17:39 CET)

Using German phrases on my family and teaching my small sister as a way to help me remember. Whether or not her family speaks German, using it in this setting reaffirms her achievements as a learner of a foreign language. By teaching her sister, she engages in higher levels of knowledge processing, and exercises her control, communication and confidence skills, akin to learning through teaching, which has been hailed as one of the most effective learning methods (Martin, 2000). Furthermore, it is highly likely that she is motivating the next generation of German learners; just as the two participants in this study (PG5 & PG6) cite the positive influence of their siblings as their motivation for choosing German in school.[68]

4.4. Grammatical correctness as the goal

Statements from the learners reveal that the choice and preference for specific learning strategies are determined by how well these approaches accelerate the mastery of grammatical rules and structure. The underlying notion is that grammatical correctness underlies communication, which is evident in that the learners' affirmation that the difficulty of the grammatical rules and structures hamper their attempts to use the German language (See section 4.2.2.2.). It is therefore not surprising that the learners' efforts are consciously geared towards the mastery of these rules and structures that govern the German language:

- KG6: *Trying to speak the language regularly on a daily basis since it helps you in the knowing of the rules*
- SB10: *practicing German regularly so that I am versed with the rules of the language as well as improving my vocabulary and speech*
- PG3: *I learn German best by studying sentence structures, listening to a conversation as well as construct sentences of my own*

[68] PG5: *I have always had an interest in languages and cultures foreign in nature, plus positive influence from my sister*
- PG6: *I have a sister who did German in high school. She got an A and that gave me the motivation to learn German.*

- PG4: *I learn German best by speaking and listening. This enhances my sentence construction as well as helps me in applying the German language rules.*

Additionally, this implies the fusion of grammatical knowledge and the knowledge of the German language; such that mastery of the grammatical knowledge is equated to mastery of the German knowledge, and the mastery of the latter deemed impossible without the former. This could be further elaborated by the curricular stipulations of teaching and learning German in Kenyan secondary schools, whereby assessment in the form of tests and examinations play a big role in determining mastery and success. It also adds to the argument that the implicit German knowledge of Kenyan learners is based upon their explicit grammatical knowledge.[69]

4.5. The examination factor

Kenya currently follows the so-called 8-4-4-education system. It is a centralized system comprising 8 years in the primary school, 4 years in the secondary school and 4 years at the university for a Bachelor's degree (apart from courses in medicine, engineering, architecture etc.). The Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development is mandated with the curriculum development for use in the primary and secondary schools. The Kenyan National Examination Council is responsible for the centralized national examinations at the end of the primary (Kenyan Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE)) and secondary (Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE)) school levels.

Progression onto the next level of the system is determined by the performance in the national exams, and this, as has been observed, leads to an education system that is examination-oriented,[70] often times with detrimental results (Mackatiani, 2017). Every activity in the schools is geared towards raising the school's mean score by ensuring that as many learners as possible make it to the

[69] See 1.2.2.4, 2.3.5.
[70] "Examination oriented approaches do not address the acquisition of practical skills, values and attitudes in the learners. The approaches merely concentrate on passing of national examination by pupils" (Mackatiani, 2017, p. 51).

top percentile of the national candidates. This pressure is spread to the individual subjects, since a school's mean score is determined by the performance in every subject. It is therefore common to hear talk of "subject xyz is dragging down the school's mean score", which is a call upon teachers and leaners to work on improvement.[71]. As a result, the learners are subjected to rigorous continuous assessment tests (CATs) in a bid to test their preparedness for the final exams.

Given this environment, it is conceivable that examinations are pivotal to the perceptions and actions of the Kenyan learners of German; every interaction with the German language is seen through the gaze of the examination, and this is evident in the learners' perception of the learnability of the language, their choice of learning strategy and their judgement on the potential of their multilinguality as s resource.

The examination factor is seen in the learners' perception of the German language in terms of ease and difficulty, e.g. in the case of SB6 whose assessment of grammar as easy is based purely on his ability to answer questions requiring the use of modal auxiliary verbs (SB6: *Grammar because it is quite simple and easy to apply during examinations such as modal verbs*). The same is seen in the following statements, in which learners base their evaluation of difficulty on their ability to handle tasks in the examination:

- KG5: *Learning artikels could be hard. In an exam, your answer might require knowledge of the article of a word which you have not come across yet. Here, all you can do is guess. The issue is there is hardly a rule on which words take the neutral, female or male genders*
- MB4: *Connection of correct articles to nouns. Arranging sentences which are grammatically correct. The difference in the use of Akkusativ and Dativ. Lengthy passages in exams whereby you aren't familiar with most words*

[71] To reinforce this competitiveness, many schools pay out incentives to the top performing teachers and learners in the national examinations (See also Duflo et al., 2011, p. 1740).

The centrality of testing and examinations is also evident in the learners' choice of learning strategies, e.g.:

SB2: […] *I also go through revision exercises and past papers to further improve my German*, PG8: […] *Doing a lot of German papers that test what we learn* […]. Following these learners' sentiments, it is clear that success in the learning of the German language is measured in terms of passing examination, and not necessarily being able to meet communicative needs. This highlights some dynamics that must be taken into account in that cannot be ignored in the consideration of learning German in Kenyan secondary schools.

4.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, the learners' awareness of their multilinguality was discussed under three broad aspects of the learners' awareness of interacting and interdependent language systems, their engagement with the German language as subject matter to be learned as well as their preferred learning strategies. The discussion brought forth some contextual specificities that define the learning of German as a foreign language in Kenyan secondary school; most notably the impact of the Kenyan sociolinguistic and educational landscape on the learners' linguistic perception and behaviour and how this is transferred onto the learning of German as a foreign language. This reinforces the arguments advanced in the explication of the Dynamic Systems Theory and the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism, that the individual's multilingual composition is anchored in their sociolinguistic space (sections 2.7.2, 2.8.1).

5. DEVELOPING AN ASSESSMENT OF THE AWARENESS OF CROSS-LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE

Introduction

After looking at the awareness of multilinguality among Kenyan learners of German and its place in their learning of German as a foreign language in the previous chapter, this study now turns to the learners' ability to apply this awareness in the engagement with errors in the German language arising from the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili.

5.1. Assessing the awareness of cross-linguistic influence: Why the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test (UGJT)?

To investigate the learners' awareness of cross-linguistic influence, this study developed and made use of an Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test (UGJT) comprising of 20 ungrammatical German sentences, whose errors are as a result of cross-linguistic influence from English and Kiswahili. The test aimed at assessing the learners' ability to identify and explain these errors while making the cross-linguistic connection between English, Kiswahili, and German.

The UGJT used in this study was modelled after the conceptualisations of the measurement of explicit knowledge in language learning and acquisition, most notably the (Untimed) Grammaticality Judgement Tests (Bialystok, 1979; Ellis, 1991, 2004; Ellis et al., 2009; Han & Ellis, 1998), the Grammaticality Explanation Test (Green & Hecht, 1992), and the Metalinguistic Knowledge (and Awareness) Tests (Alderson, Clapham, & Steel, 1997; Tellier, 2013). These tests require the learners to draw upon the analytical and controlled nature of explicit knowledge in order to make judgement about and give explanations of grammatical errors in the test items. In other words, they require the learners to make use of their knowledge about language, and not only their knowledge of language to tackle them. Knowledge about language is at the core of language awareness, since, as it has been established, grammaticality judgements are also metalinguistic, in that

they treat language as an object (Chraudron, 1983), which is one of the main features of language awareness.

5.1.1. Operationalization criteria of the UGJT

This study's UGJT, like the tests named above, is based on the distinctions made between implicit and explicit knowledge,[72] and developed in accordance to the following assessment criteria as defined in Ellis, (2015, p. 428); Roehr-Brackin, (2018, p. 114):

a) Degree of awareness
b) Time available
c) Focus of attention
d) Utility of knowledge of metalanguage

With regard to the degree of awareness, the UGJT expects learners to apply their knowledge of the grammatical rules of German, English, and Kiswahili in an analytical and controlled manner, to identify and explain the errors in German as well as make the cross-linguistic connection between the three languages. Consequently, it becomes possible to establish how well the tested grammatical aspects are developed.

The test is untimed, which means that the learners had as much time as needed to work on the test. This was meant to allow the learners time to synthesize their thoughts, hence draw upon their explicit knowledge of the rules and structures of the languages, instead of relying on instinct. Time pressure has been identified as a decisive determinant of the knowledge the learners fall back on to solve the tasks, with learners drawing upon implicit knowledge in the timed tests and explicit knowledge in the untimed tests (Bialystok, 1979; Ellis, 2004, 2015; Ellis et al., 2009; Roehr-Brackin, 2018, pp. 119–120).

Seeing that learning German in Kenyan secondary schools is largely form-focused with an emphasis on grammar,[73] the UGJT focused on the learners'

[72] See 1.2.2.
[73] Discussed in 1.2.2.4, 1.4.2, Chapter 4.

mastery of grammatical knowledge and their ability to apply it to identify and explain the errors in the German language, as well draw parallels to the grammatical structures of English and Kiswahili in tracing the cross-linguistic influence.

As is characteristic of form-focused grammar lessons, the knowledge of grammatical terminology plays central role in language learning. The same goes for the Kenyan learners of German, hence the design of the UGJT in such a way that learners can and should apply grammatical terminology as metalanguage in their engagement of the presented errors. As will be discussed later, the knowledge of grammatical terminology is regarded as one of the measures of metalinguistic knowledge in this study's assessment.

With regard to the use of metalinguistic knowledge, the UGJT builds on the criterion of awareness, in which learners are expected to make use of their knowledge about language to tackle the items. This analytical controlled use of language is consistent with the reflexive nature of metalinguistic knowledge (Chraudron, 1983, p. 344; Bialystok, 1979, 1986, 1987, 1991, 1994)).

5.1.2. Rationale for developing the UGJT

The UGJT comprised of 20 ungrammatical items. The ungrammaticality stems from errors traceable to cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German. The development of the test was built upon the findings of the studies of Agoya-Wotsuna (2012) and Hinga (2015), which established the presence of transfer in the written and spoken German of Kenyan secondary school learners. The transfers manifest as phonological, lexical-semantic and morphosyntactic errors.

In addition to these two studies, the researcher engaged teachers of the German language at the German Cultural Centre (Goethe-Institut) in Nairobi. These teachers, -some of who also teach German at the secondary schools that took part in this study- have many years of experience of teaching German as a foreign language. They came up with a list of the common errors Kenyan learners of German make. And since these teachers all speak English and

Kiswahili as well as the other languages of the learners, they are able to infer the cross-linguistic influence of these languages on German.

From the two combined sources, 20 (twenty) items were selected on the basis of their recurrence and prominence. Since this was a written test, the included errors were restricted to the morphosyntactic and lexical-semantic realizations. The errors are deviations from the standard German language taught in schools.

Standard German is defined as "the binding form of written and spoken language that is also used as the reference point for school lessons"(*Standardsprache—Wortbedeutung.info*, 2019).[74] It is understood as the prescribed linguistic and grammatical regulations governing a language. Materials used for institutional language learning and teaching are aligned to these regulations. The standard German language differs from the colloquial "Umgangssprache" variety and the various dialects present in German speaking regions, and as is the case in other languages, adherence to the standard code is more pronounced in the written form unlike in the spoken form (Siebenhaar & Voegeli, 1997). Consequently, some of the constructions presented as errors in this study are acceptable in the colloquial and spoken form, but are regarded as such in the formal standard language because they deviate from the prescribed grammatical regulations.

5.1.2.1. Items containing morphosyntactic errors/deviations

Morphosyntactic errors in the German language are described as errors in the morphology (e.g. wrong ending of the conjugated verb) or in the syntax (e.g. word order errors) (Kleppin, 1997, p. 42) (Original in German, translation by author). Morphology and syntax are said to be at the core of grammar (Müller, 2009, p. 107).

Morphemes are defined as "the smallest meaning-bearing units of language" (Beedham, 1995, p. 18), and are classified into lexical and grammatical morphemes. The grammatical morphemes are further divided into derivational morphemes (facilitating word building, e.g. prefixes and suffixes) and inflectional

[74] Original German, translation author.

morphemes (affixes that facilitate concordance e.g. verb endings in conjugation, plural markings etc.) (See also Beedham, 1995, p. 19, pp. 102-3).

Syntax is "the study of how words are put together to form sentences, both in terms of the order of the words, and in terms of which words can appear with which other words in a sentence, i.e. the combinatorial possibilities of words (Beedham, 1995, p. 19). In the German language, for example, nouns are combined with their gender defining articles, which undergo declension according to the case, quantity, etc. The errors captured in this study range from deviations in the standard German grammatically defined word orders to incomplete or faulty combinations (the linguistic explanation of the deviations is described in detail in chapter 6):

- Wir sind lesen ein Buch.
- Du isst was?
- Er kann spielen Fußball
- Ich bin Mädchen/Ich bin Junge
- Ich gehe nicht in die Schule, weil ich bin krank.
- Ich habe eine Katze. Es heißt Mai.
- Mein Bruder hat gekocht Ugali.
- Die Hose ist mehr teuer als die Bluse
- Wir schlafen in Schule

5.1.2.2. Items containing lexical-semantic errors/deviations

Lexical-semantic errors have been described as the use of a wrong word in a particular context leading to the change of meaning (Kleppin, 1997, p. 42). [75] The error occurs because lexemes are realised as words, and just like morphemes, they carry meaning, the difference being that unlike morphemes, they are complete on their own. As Beedham states:

> "Words are stable in the sense that they are not normally broken up into smaller parts in the way that phrases and sentences can be; and words are freely

[75] Original in German, translation by author

reproducible, for example a single word can constitute an utterances in the reply to a question […]"(Beedham, 1995, p. 23)

The study of how these words carry meaning is covered by semantics, hence the lexical-semantic bundling up. The logical connection is that since words carry meaning, the use of the wrong word would affect communication since it changes and/or even distorts the meaning of the utterance, causing confusion and misunderstandings.

On account of their multilinguality, Kenyan learners of German encounter words in German that sound similar to words in the languages they know, and they might assume that they carry the same meaning in German as they do in the languages they know.[76] A classic example is the word "gift" whose equivalence is "poison" in German, but there are still cases of learners who use *Meine Mutter hat Geburtstag, ich kaufe ihr ein Gift* to mean that they're buying their mother a birthday present:

- Wie geht's dir? > ich bin gut!
- Meine Mutter hat Geburtstag. Ich möchte ihr ein Gift kaufen
- >Wie spät ist es? <Es ist zwei Uhr (0800Uhr)
- Es möchte regnen.
- Was ist dein Name?
- Ich habe Deutsch seit 3 Jahren gelesen
- Ich bin ein Student in der Sekundarschule
- >Danke schön! < Willkommen!
- Ich möchte Arzt bekommen
- Hilf mir mit einer Flasche
- Ich möchte nach Deutschland fliegen, das ist warum ich lerne Deutsch.

[76] "False friends" resulting from cognates that look and/or sound the same in German and English have been comprehensively discussed by Hufeisen in her publication "English im Unterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache"(Hufeisen, 1994), also under "faux amis" (Eckhard-Black & Whittle, 1992, pp. 370–386)

5.1.3. Selected Kenyan-Specific sociolinguistic factors in the development of the UGJT

In addition to the above-discussed considerations, there were other contextual factors that were taken into account in the development of the UGJT. These serve to explain the Kenyan-specific trends of cross-linguistic influence manifested in the presented errors. These include the notions of "polylanguaging" as a means of harnessing one's diverse linguistic resources as well as that of "Kenyan English", which - as will be discussed - contains certain traits that differ from the recognized standards of English. While these phenomena are functional linguistic characteristics of the multilingual socio-linguistic space that is Kenya, they are constantly juxtaposed to the prescriptivist normativity of standard language(s), especially that which is aspired by school language learning curricula.

5.1.3.1. Polyanguaging

This study aligns itself to Jørgensen et al.'s definition of polylanguaging, which is "the use of resources associated with different 'languages' even when the speaker knows very little of these"(Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen, & Møller, 2011, p. 27). In their explication of the notion of polylanguaging, Jørgensen et al. argue that the linguistic practices of multlinguals refuse to be confined to the essentialized "pure" language entities. They posit that language is social, in that it is adaptable to the setting instead of being controlled by the rigidity of linguistic rules.

The linguistic practices of Kenyans, especially in regular everyday exchanges are characterized by a fluid interwovenness of all the linguistic resources present in the individuals' repertoire. This, just like in the case of the subjects in the Jørgensen et al.'s study makes it harder to mark where one language ends and another begins; unlike in the case of code-mixing and code switching, where the matrix and embedded languages are easily identifiable. This is why the answer to the question "what language are you speaking?" is not always so straightforward, because it is hard to reduce this rich medium to a single language.

The polylanguaging character of Kenyans is evident in the following exchanges on Facebook[77]

Figure 1: Excerpt from Facebook exchanges

Some of the markers of polylanguaging evident in these excerpts include:

i. Code mixing and switching e.g.

- "hutry" (Txt.1); the Kiswahili habitual tense marker "hu-" and the English "try", meaning "(I) usually/do try"
- "kalipstick"(Txt.1); the diminutive marker in Kiswahili "ka-" and the English noun lipstick, to mean "a little bit of lipstick"
- "kumu harass" (Txt.2); the Kiswahili infinitive verb prefix "ku-", the Kiswahili indirect object marker "-m-" (here with the vowel "u" added to conform to open syllables of Eastern Kenyan Highlands Bantu languages) and the English "harass", meaning "to harass him"
- "ume m short list"(Txt.2); the Kiswahili subject marker "u-", the Kiswahili tense marker "me-", the object marker "m-" and the English verb shortlist, meaning "you have shortlisted him"

[77] https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=10217655234518625&id=1412108117 (Heartfelt gratitude to Madina Chege for the data)

- "ku explain"; the Kiswahili infinitive verb prefix "ku-" and the English verb "explain , meaning "to explain"
- Code switching manifests through the alternation lexemes belonging to various linguistic codes intra- and extra- sententially.

ii. Kikuyunization of English words, e.g. "kuimajini" (Txt. 2), in this case with the Kikuyu infinitive marker "ku-" and the localization of the English verb "imagine".

iii. Abrogation of the Standard Kiswahili spelling, e.g. dropping the "h" in "ata" instead of "hata" (Txt.2), "anaaribu" instead of "anaharibu" (Txt. 2), "Aki" instead of "haki" (Txt. 3), "uyo" instead of "huyo" (Txt.3), also the replacement of "wa" with "ua" as well as well as the addition of "y" in "tuambiye" (Txt.2)

- The adoption of the short form "mi" instead of "mimi" (Txt. 1)

iv. The adoption of orthographic realizations containing phonological cross-linguistic influence from other Kenyan languages (commonly known as "shrubbing"(Mendoza-Denton & Osborne, 2010, p. 121; Wairungu, 2014); "imachini" (Txt.1), "matamchi"(Txt.1), "girlshaod" (Txt.3).

v. Use of established Sheng words, e.g. "kubonga"(Txt.1) meaning "to speak", "Fisis" (Txt.1) which is used to refer to crafy/sly young men (singular "fisi") "unachochwa" (Txt.1) which has the meaning of you're being flattered or made to feel good about yourself.[78]

vi. Phonetic spelling; "mshosho"(Txt.1) which is a one of the phonological realization[79] of the Kikuyu <cũcũ>, and refers to "grandmother". The affixation of the prefix "m" renders it pejorative.

The presence of all these linguistic variations elaborates the dynamism of the Kenyan linguistic practice. This practice is similar to the notion of the interwovenness and interdependence of languages making up a multilingual's system, as advanced in the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism(Herdina & Jessner,

[78] Dictionary of Sheng-English lexicon ('Online Lexicon: Sheng - English', n.d. accessed 25.10.2018).
[79] This variety is associated with urbanites.

2002), since all the languages and dialects of the interlocutors are drawn into delivery, and are depicted as extremely flexible and malleable in practice.

Kenyans are clearly uninhibited by the linguistic rules governing the many language systems making up their repertoire. The interlocutors in this exchange are well-educated professionals, so their failure to adhere to the rules cannot be said to be due to low proficiency, rather as a resistance to the hegemony of standardized languages, as discussed in 1.3.4.

Learners of German in Kenya are used to this linguistic practice that is marked by so much flexibility. The question is if and how they are able to sift through it and draw boundaries between the linguistic entanglements characteristic of their everyday language use and the essentialised "grammatically correct" resources that they need to learn the defined language that is German. If and how they do it is what the UGJT set out to assess.

5.1.3.2. "Kenyan English"

Given the status of English as the "language of the world" and its status as the global lingua franca (Alptekin, 2002), it is taught in many societies as the first foreign language. This means that German, for the majority of its learners, comes in as a second foreign language. While there have been quite a number of studies on learning German as a second/tertiary foreign language (after English) (Hufeisen, 1994, 2000; Hufeisen & Lindemann, 1998; Hufeisen et al., 2004; Gerhard Neuner, 1999; Wrembel, 2013),[80] not much has been done on learning German in contexts where English does not have the foreign language status, like in Kenya.

English, being one of the many Kenyan languages, has also been "kenyanised", leading to a discrepancy between the English used for everyday communication and the English taught in school (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, p. 270). There are studies discussing the "peculiarities" of the Kenyan English with regard to its phonology and pronunciation, grammar, spelling and punctuation, morphology,

[80] Specifically DaFnE (Deutsch nach Englisch = German L3 after English L2, third language acquisition/tertiary language learning)(Marx & Hufeisen, 2007, p. 308)

syntax, and lexicon, discourse etc. (Buregeya, 2006, 2013; Kanyoro, 1991; Schmied, 2008). In these studies, it has been established that the Kenyan English has also been influenced by other languages that coexist in the Kenyan sociolinguistic space, an inevitable consequence, also from the perspective of the Dynamic Model of multilingualism. As a result of this cross-linguistic influence, Kenyan English contains some deviations from the world's standard Englishes.

These deviations, however, have become entrenched as part of the Kenyan English, and are not regarded as erroneous among the majority of the Kenyan users of English (See Buregeya, 2006). If measured against Standard English, then some phrases like "she heard the baby kick"[81] (instead of "she felt the baby kick") and others like "[…] kindly assist us with the Ref. No. issued so we can be able to follow up"[82] and others highlighted in the newspaper article '*My names are…' and other crimes* by Prof. Okoth Okombo of the University of Nairobi,[83] are ungrammatical. The concern for German as a foreign language in Kenya is that the learners use English as the bridge language, as evidenced by the learners' responses in 4.1.1. But it is English that is –compared to the recognized standards- ungrammatical, hence presenting the danger of passing along these ungrammaticalities to the German language.

These entrenched structures[84] informed the inclusion of items that contain multi-levelled transfer, i.e. errors in German that can be traced back to constructions that are ungrammatical in English; but are entrenched in the Kenyan English, e.g. "Du isst was?" "Es möchte regnen", "Hilf mir mit einer Flasche". There are studies taking a similar perspective, e.g. Trévise on transfer of metalinguistic knowledge from French onto English amongst French learners' of English as a second language pointed to possible fossilisation hence transfer of inaccurate metalinguistic representations from French onto English, in the case

[81] *http://mummytales.com/i-lost-my-baby-at-37-weeks-pregnant-this-is-what-happened-june-mbithe-mulis-story/* .
[82] https://twitter.com/KenyaPower_Care/status/1050713506402721792.
[83] (Okombo, 2015) https://www.nation.co.ke/lifestyle/artculture/wrong-use-of-English-phrases-in-Kenya/1954194-2615354-f6fqjjz/index.html.
[84] Similar to the notion of "fossilization" discussed in the context of interlanguage (Selinker, 1972) and the approximative language systems and other partial achievement models in the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, pp. 43–46).

of the grammatical phenomena of the past historic, the imperfect and present perfect tenses (Trévise, 1996). The UGJT seeks to establish if the learners, in the (self-) reflective mode, would discern the ungrammaticality of these constructions in English, which would be marker of multilingual language learning awareness.

5.1.4. Objectives and processes of the UGJT

As mentioned, the UGJT comprised 20 sentences that contravene the rules of standard German language grammar at the morpho-syntactic and lexical-semantic levels. The UGJT required the learners to tap into their metalinguistic knowledge and offer explanations of the presented errors. In doing so, one gets an insight into the learners' awareness of how the languages they bring with them into learning German –in this case English and Kiswahili –affect their German language skills, and consequently answers the questions:

1. To what extent is the metalinguistic knowledge of Kenyan learners developed?
2. How do they use this knowledge to deal with errors in German, arising from cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili?

Tests of explicit knowledge are designed to get the learners to engage in the following processes (Ellis, 2004, p. 254):

a) Discriminate between well-formed and deviant sentences
b) Locate the errors in deviant sentences
c) Correct the errors
d) Provide grammatical descriptions of the errors.

The present study focuses on (b), (c), and (d), since all the items contain errors, and the respondents are informed of this. The decision to include only ungrammatical items was informed by the observation that learners tend and need to draw upon explicit knowledge in the identification and explanation of the ungrammatical entities (Ellis, 1991, p. 178, 2015, p. 433; Ellis et al., 2009, pp. 59, 98; Roehr-Brackin, 2018, pp. 119–120).

For the learner to accomplish the above, they need to engage three principal processing operations (Ellis, 2004):

1. Semantic processing (i.e., understanding the meaning of a sentence)
2. Noticing (i.e., searching to establish whether something is formally incorrect in the sentence)
3. Reflecting (i.e., considering what is incorrect about the sentence and, possibly, why it is incorrect)

The UGJT adapted for this study introduces another aspect, which could be seen as an extension of "Reflecting"; that of making the connection of Cross-Linguistic Influence, by deciding whether the error stems from the influence of Kiswahili and/or English on German. This builds on the calls for the investigation of leaners' conscious understanding of the grammatical contrasts between their L1 and L2 Ellis (2004; p. 243, p. 266). This test seeks to expand this by tapping into the learners' metalinguistic and explicit knowledge, to get them to reflect on how their learned and acquired languages (English and Kiswahili) influence their L3 (German) (See also Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009; Cenoz, Hufeisen, & Jessner, 2001; Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Hofer, 2015; Hufeisen, 2003; Roberts, 2011).

Given the conclusion that "tests of explicit language le[a]d to fuller use of metalinguistic knowledge" (Roehr-Brackin, 2018, p. 115), the UGJT is conceptualised to get the learners to apply their metalinguistic knowledge to:

i. Identify the errors in deviant sentences;
ii. Provide grammatical explanations of the errors;
iii. Explain if the error is caused by Cross-Linguistic Influence from English and/or Kiswahili i.e. make the cross-linguistic connection;
iv. Correct the error.

In carrying out these procedures, the learners must draw into their explicit knowledge of the German, English, and Kiswahili languages. The errors target various grammatical phenomena, and their ability to describe and explain them give insight into the state of their development, as Ellis states:

> [G]rammaticality judgements provide one of the best ways of studying the "mental structures and processes that make learning possible." This is because it is believed they obviate the need for the learner to access the processing systems responsible for using the underlying grammar in actual performance (Ellis, 1991, p. 163).

5.2. Analysis of the elicited data

This section discusses the learners' responses to the items presented in the UGJT, by analysing them as evidence of their awareness of the influence from English and Kiswahili on German grammar. The analysis takes a two-pronged approach:

1. Classification and evaluation of the learners' explanations of the violated grammatical rules leading to the error (for the selected items)- using the Metalingusitic rating Scale, and the consequent definition of the learners' development of metalinguistic skills
2. Qualitative explication of the learners' explanations of the Cross-Linguistic Influence from English and Kiswahili on German

5.3. Data presentation and preparation

The learners' answers to the UGJT items were all copied to Excel-sheets to enable a more convenient and comprehensive overview (Figure 1 below). The learners' identities were codified for anonymity, with the learners being assigned a combination of their school initials and a number, i.e. KG1-KG13 for Kaaga Girls' High School, SB1-SB11 for Starehe Boys' Centre, MB1-MB7 for Meru School and PG1-PG8 for Precious Blood Riruta.[85] Some words and phrases used by the learners were abbreviated for convenience, e.g. DT for Direct translation, SWA for Kiswahili, EN for English, and GER for German.

[85] The learners wrote their names and the names of their school on the test sheets as well as the questionnaires to enable the reconciliation of the documents.

Item 1: Wir sind	error ID/ expalnation	From?	Explanation	Correction
KG 1	2 verbs, verb position	EN	DT -We're reading a book	✓
KG 2	2 verbs, position of main verb (spielen)	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
KG 3	Positioning of verb	EN	DT- we are reading a book	Wir sind ein Buch lesen
KG 4	2 verbs, position of the verbs (lesen)	EN	DT- We are reading a book	wir lesen ein Buch
KG 5	wrong verb position, 2 verbs, none of which is a modal/helping ver	EN/SWA	DT (We are reading a book/tunasoma kitabu)	✓
KG 6	2 verbs, verb position (lesen)	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
KG 7	2 verbs	EN	DT- we are reading a book	✓
KG 8	2 verbs, verb position	EN	DT- we are reading a book	✓
KG 9	Verb postion (lesen)	EN/SWA	.....Tunasoma kitabu, we are reading a book	Wir sind ein Buch lesen
KG 10	2 verbs, wrong position of the verb "lesen"	EN/SWA	direct translation(we are reading a book/tunasoma kitabu)	✓
KG 11	2 verbs (sind, lesen), verb position (lesen)	EN	DT	✓
KG 12	2 verbs, verb position (lesen)	EN	DT: We are reading the book	✓
KG 13	Using "sind" and "lesen" together	EN	DT	✓
SB 1	2 verbs following each other	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
SB 2	2 verbs don't occur together in German	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
SB 3	The sentence has 2 verbs following each other	EN	DT	✓
SB 4	The sentence is wrong b/c it is a direct translation	EN	Traced to EN (We are reading a book)	✓
SB 5	There are 2 verbs in the sentence	EN	....	✓
SB 6	2 verbs. Direct translation	EN	....	wir lesen ein Buch sind
SB 7	It is a direct translation having 2 verbs	EN	....	✓
SB 8	One cannot have 2 verbs in a sentence unless 1 is a helping verb	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
SB 9	There are 2 verbs following each other	EN	DT	✓
SB 10	"sind" and "lesen" should not be used together	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
SB 11	The word order is wrong	EN	Traced to EN (wir are reading a book)	✓
MB 1	The verb "sind"	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
MB 2	The verb "sind"	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
MB 3	The verb "sind" should not be there	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
MB 4	Use of "sind" which is irrelevant in this sentence	EN	It is in the form of English "We are reading a book"	✓
MB 5	The verb "sind"	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
MB 6	The verb "sind"	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
MB 7	The verb "sind" shouldn't be there	EN	we are reading a book	✓
PG 1	The verb "sind" shouldn't be there	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
PG 2	The verb "sind" should not be there	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
PG 3	Verb 'lesen' on the wrong position	EN	DT- We are reading a book	Wir sind ein Buch lesen
PG 4	The first verb shouldn't be there	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
PG 5	Use of the 2 verbs following each other	EN	DT- We are reading a book	✓
PG 6	The infinitive verb should be at the last position	EN	Eng sentence structure	Wir sind ein Buch lesen
PG 7	2 verbs are int he second position, only one is needed	EN/Swa	DT (We are reading a book/sisi tunasoma kitabu)	✓
PG 8	In the present tense, only one verb is necessary	EN	DT	✓

Figure 2: Excel-sheet presentation of the learners' comments

The first level of the analysis primarily focuses on the learners' comments in the second column (Error ID/explanation). This column contains the learners' answers to the question "What rule has been flouted/broken"; therefore, providing data whose analysis gives insight into the learners' grammatical knowledge of the rules of Standard German. The learners' ability to correct the error (Column 5 "Correction") is also considered in the discussion.

The second level of the analysis, in which the learners' awareness for cross-linguistic influence is discussed, focuses on columns 3 (From: To the influence of which language(s) can the error be traced?) and 4 (Explanation: How has this influence caused the error).

5.4. Scope and aim of the analysis

In their engagement with the UGJT, the learners were expected to make use of their knowledge about English and Kiswahili to identify and explain deviations in Standard German, as well as make the cross-linguistic connection to English and Kiswahili, which leads to the errors in German (cross-linguistic influence). The products of the learners' deliberations are the subject of this study's analysis, and are referred to as the "metalinguistic comments", in line with Gombert's

reference to research in metalinguistics as focusing on study of verbal products containing reflexive and analytic use of language (See Gombert, 1992, p.4). Consequently, the analysis and the ensuing discussion consider both the content (meaning) and composition (form) of the learners' metalinguistic comments, and use these to reconstruct what multilingual language learning awareness.

These metalinguistic comments are the end product of the learners' mental and cognitive process of dealing with the items in the UGJT, and through them one gains access to the learners' knowledge of and about English, Kiswahili, and German as well as their awareness of the interaction of these languages. The analysis of these comments therefore sought to establish the following:

i. Awareness of Grammar as analysed knowledge (Ellis, 2004, p. 242): The learners' mastery of the grammatical rules of the Standard German language (also English and Kiswahili); by their ability to explain the flouted rules
ii. The learners' mastery of grammatical terminology as a component of metalinguistic knowledge (Ellis, 2004, pp. 242–243)
iii. Cross-linguistic awareness (James, 1996, p. 139): The learners' ability to make the cross-linguistic connections causing the errors in the German language (in this study discussed as awareness of cross-linguistic influence), in line with Ellis' call for the investigation in the grammatical contrasts between the languages the learners know and those that they are learning (See Ellis, 2004, p. 243)

This study considers these important aspects of metalinguistic knowledge amongst multilingual foreign language learners. Focus on these aspects gives a comprehensive picture of what metalinguistic knowledge entails, and allows insight into the status of cross-linguistic awareness amongst Kenyan learners of German. It also shows where there is need for Consciousness Raising (CR), which is defined as "the deliberate attempt to draw the learner's attention to the formal properties of the target language" (Rutherford & Smith, 1985, p. 1). CR's role in bridging the gap between the mastered and yet-to-be-mastered in foreign language learning has been highlighted by Carl James, who argued that "[i]t (CR)

more probably means drawing attention to those properties the learner must learn, but might have been experiencing problems in learning" (James, 1996, p. 141). He consequently defines CR as:

> [A]ctivity that develops the ability to locate and identify the discrepancy between one's present state of knowledge and a goal state of knowledge. CR gives the learner an equally important but different insight into what he does not know and therefore needs to learn, if he is to put such deficiencies right (James, 1996, p.141).

The ultimate goal of this study, therefore, is to establish what the learners already know and where there is need for CR so as to optimise the learning of German as a foreign language among the multilingual Kenyan learners.

5.5. The Han & Ellis rating scale for metalingual comments

Han & Ellis developed a rating scale to score the learners' metalingual comments on a Grammaticality Judgment Test (Han & Ellis, 1998), in which the learners' metalingual comments were taken as measures of explicit knowledge (p. 12). This scale takes into account that the learners' explanations vary on a continuum of accuracy and precision, a factor that resonates with the stance of this study, as it avoids the correct incorrect binary in the assessment of the learners' verbalization of the grammatical rules.

Figure 2 (below) shows the Han & Ellis scale for rating metalingual comments as presented in Ellis (2004 p. 264), and shows how the learners' ability to verbalize rules is spread out over a spectrum. This approach makes it clear that perfection is not in the memorization of these grammatical rules, but rather in the learners' ability to express what they have internalized from the input they have received (see Han & Ellis, p.12).

A scale for rating metalingual comments (based on Han and Ellis, 1998)

Level	Description
0	The learner is unable to explain how he/she reaches a judgment.
1	The learner is able to identify verbally the element that is the source of the problem, but his/her explanation is incorrect and does not contain even very simple technical language.
2	The learner verbalizes a rule using at least some technical language, but the rule is incorrect.
3	The learner states a partly correct rule, or the learner states a correct rule that is imprecise and incomplete.
4	The learner states a correct rule fairly precisely using some technical language.
5	The learner states a completely correct rule using appropriate technical language.

Figure 3: Rating scale for metalingual comments (Han & Ellis, 1998; copied from Ellis, 2004 p. 264)

5.6. The Metalinguistic Rating Scale

While Han & Ellis limit their rating scale only to the measure of metalanguage in the sense of technical language (Han & Ellis, 1998, p. 12), this study understands metalanguage to refer to any language used to talk about language, whether technical or not. This approach is similar to the definition of "[m]etalanguage either as formal terminology or as informal ways of talking about language structure" (Svalberg, 2007, p. 291), and takes metalanguage as the means by which knowledge about language is made accessible. Other authors like Tunmer and Herriman have also defined metalanguage simply as "language used to describe language, and includes terms like phoneme, words, phrase etc." (in Tunmer, Pratt, & Herriman, 1984, p. 12)

Since the learners worked on an Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test, their responses to the presented errors are taken to be an outcome of a controlled and analysed process of engaging with their languages that is characteristic of metalinguistic knowledge, as was discussed in chapter one. This study in its adaptation of the scale understands the learners' responses as expressions of metalinguistic knowledge, hence refers to them as "metalinguistic comments".

By taking the learners' metalinguistic comments as the outcome of an analysed

process, the metalinguistic rating scale, therefore, goes beyond the mere assessment of the learners' metalanguage, unlike that of Han & Ellis (1998, p.12). This study's metalinguistic rating scale assesses the outcome of the application of analysed knowledge (Ellis, 2004, p. 265), here seen as the combination of the learners' knowledge and ability to explain the flouted ruled, as well as the metalangauge as grammatical terminology. In line with the premise that metalinguistic knowledge should be verbalizable (Ellis, 2004, p. 239, 2005a, p. 150; Ellis et al., 2009, p. 150; Han & Ellis, 1998), it follows that development level of a learner's metalinguistic knowledge will correspond to his/her ability to explain the flouted rule.

The verbalizable and declarative character of metalinguistic knowledge is significant because it allows access into the knowledge about language that is in the learners' mind. The evaluation also adheres to the position that it is possible to possess and make use of metalinguistic knowledge without necessarily applying technical language (in this case referred to as grammatical terminology) (Ellis, 2004, p. 239; Ellis et al., 2009, p. 134; James & Garrett, 1992).

The evaluation applied in this study uses the metalinguistic rating scale to rank the learners' metalinguistic comments according to the following levels of acceptability as summarized below:

Level	Description
0	Inability to explain the error marked by: - Blank space on the questionnaire - Unintelligible explanation - Totally unacceptable explanation without grammatical terminology
1	Unacceptable explanation but using some form of grammatical terminology

2	The explanation is partly acceptable, but too general, imprecise or incomplete. It also contains inappropriate grammatical terminology or none whatsoever
3	The explanation is partly acceptable, but too general, imprecise or incomplete, and it contains some appropriate grammatical terminology
4	The explanation is acceptable, but does not contain grammatical terminology
5	The explanation is acceptable as correct and contains appropriate grammatical terminology

Table 2: The metalinguistic rating scale

5.6.1. Why the metalinguistic rating scale?

Departing from the understanding of metalinguistic knowledge as controlled and analysed language use, the use of the Metalinguistic Scale enables an empirical typification of the learners' metalinguistic knowledge. It also allows an explication of what this knowledge entails among Kenyan multilingual leaners of German. The learners' ability to use this knowledge to identify and explain errors in the German language resulting from cross-linguistic influence from English and Kiswahili denotes a corresponding awareness of this phenomenon.

This evaluation, therefore, refrains from the use of the correct-incorrect dichotomy in the analysis of the learners' descriptions and explanations of the errors, and instead adopts an "acceptability scale", whereby comments are rated based on their potential to explain the presented error. The used scale covers a continuum ranging from wholly unacceptable, partially acceptable, to fully acceptable, based on how well the subjects' comments can be reconstructed to correct the errors; the more specific and precise the error explanation is, then the higher the rating (Schütze, 1996, pp. 62–70).

The evaluation also adheres to the position that it is possible to possess and make use of metalinguistic knowledge without necessarily applying technical language/grammatical terminology, similar to that taken by James & Garrett

(1992, p. 7) and Ellis (2004, p. 239), although knowledge of grammatical terminology is an aspect of metalinguistic knowledge (Han& Ellis, 1998, p. 12).

5.6.2. Rating: A triangulated approach involving multiple raters

The researcher and three other individuals undertook the rating of the learners' metalinguistic comments into the metalinguistic scale. All four are all involved in the teaching of German as a foreign language. The researcher and one other rater are Kenyans working in the Kenyan context, while the other two raters are L1-German speakers and are also involved in the teaching of German as a foreign language - one in the West African region, the other in South America. All four are well versed in the dynamics involved in the learning and teaching of German as a foreign language, and have encountered errors arising from cross-linguistic influence of various languages in the course of their teaching. Moreover, they have a realistic picture of what and how much learners at the level of this study's participants really know. Their engagement, therefore, was meant to increase reliability and ensure an evaluation commensurate to the learners' level of proficiency (See also Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, p. 67).

Engaging multiple raters fits into the construct of investigator triangulation, which is defined as the involvement of multiple investigators/researchers in a single study (Archibald, 2016, pp. 228–229; Mathison, 1988, p. 14). This practice, like all other triangulated approaches aims at improving the credibility of the research process, due to the corroborative and validating function of triangulation. The nature of this study's data as well as the analyses approach taken necessitated the corroboration by people with experience working with learners of German as a foreign language, given that:

i. The learners' metalinguistic comments are outcomes of their explicit knowledge, which was characterised as "imprecise and inaccurate" (Ellis, 2004, p. 237). This means that their assessment and consequent rating is based on interpretation, which is highly subjective. Multiple raters render relative objectivity to the assessment, since an

evaluation that has been agreed upon by more people goes beyond an individual's preference and bias.

ii. Tied to the inaccurate and imprecise nature of the learners' metalinguistic comments, the analysis rejects the correct-incorrect dichotomy in favour of an acceptability scale, whose factors are discussed below (5.6.3). The decision of what is acceptable is more credible when made by multiple people, rather than an individual.

5.6.3. Rating guidelines

To determine acceptability levels, the metalinguistic comments were classified according to their retraceability potential, i.e. to the extent to which the explanation can be applied to the correction of the deviation. This means that precision plays a crucial role in the determination of acceptability; the more explicit the explanation is about what needs to be done to correct the error, then the higher it is rated in the metalinguistic rating scale.

In addition to the precision of the explanation, the appropriate use of grammatical terminology means a higher rating in the scale. Mastery of the grammatical terminology is crucial because the teachers of German as well as the course books frequently make reference to and use of this terminology. It is also considered a vital aspect of metalanguage, and it has been established that there is a correlation between its mastery and success in language learning:

> Indeed, it would appear that whatever the explicit knowledge looks like, it must include metalanguage, and this metalanguage must include words for grammatical categories and functions. It might therefore be predicted that successful language learners would have greater metalinguistic knowledge than those who are relatively less successful (Alderson et al., 1997, p. 97).

5.6.3.1. The retraceability potential

The principle of the retraceability potential as used in this study refers to the extent to which the learners' explanation offers pointers to what should be done to correct the error; hence the emphasis on clarity and precision as has been mentioned above. Adopting this approach is informed by the stance of this study

that metalinguistic knowledge is not about the memorization of rules, but more about the mastery and internalization of the grammatical knowledge, in order to draw upon it to improve their language proficiency and performance. A similar approach was taken by Green and Hecht with their Grammaticality Explanation Test, in which the learners' were asked to "offer explanations or rules that would enable someone making those errors to understand and correct them" (Green & Hecht, 1992, p. 170) .

From the discussion in sections 4.2.2.2 and 4.4, the centrality of grammatical knowledge for the Kenyan learners of German is established. The learners' ability to explain the identify and explain the infraction leading to the error would be a sure way of assessing their comprehension of the rules guiding the grammatical phenomena presented in the items of the UGJT.

5.6.3.2. Grammatical terminology

The place and role of grammar in the form-focused German lesson in Kenyan secondary schools cannot be overstated, especially because of the examination factor.[86] From the discussion in chapter 4, it is also clear that mastery of grammar is of utmost importance to the learners, and that for them, knowledge of German grammar equals knowledge of the German language. Knowledge of grammatical terminology is part and parcel of grammar. Besides, as Berman states, knowledge of grammatical terminology helps in the orientation in language thereby making it easier:

> Such terms, we feel, are the essence of any rule based grammar: They are part and parcel of having studied a subject, in this case a language: They represent a shortcut to all kinds of devious circumlocutions; they are useful mnemonic devices; and they help students to categorize appropriately by fulfilling the classic function of labelling or "naming" the elements and classes in question. Besides, they are necessary for precise formulations- for circumlocutions, such as calling quantifiers "expressions of quantity" or determiners "words that go with nouns" are not merely clumsier and more time-and-space-consuming; they are imprecise and hence misleading (Berman, 1979, p. 295).

[86] Discussion in section 1.4.2., 4.5.

As discussed in section 1.4.2, the learner of German in Kenyan secondary schools is confronted with grammatical terminology right from the first chapter of their course books. The language of the classroom includes statements like “fill in the personal pronouns”, “conjugate the verb”, “fill in the endings”, “underline the adjectives” etc. It is for this reason that this study factors in the appropriate use of grammatical terminology in the rating of the learners’ metalinguistic comments, hence a learner who uses the grammatical terminology “verb” in reference to “sind” is rated higher than one who uses “word” (In the metalinguistic rating scale).

5.6.3. The retraceability potential and grammatical terminology as measure of acceptability

The evaluation therefore combines and considers both the retraceability potential of a comment as well the grammatical terminology to determine its classification in the scale. The highest rated comments therefore contain high retraceability potential and appropriate grammatical terminology.

The principles are adapted to the particularity of each item, such that for morphosyntactic constructions where the deviation is in the position of - say- a verb, then a simple mention of the verb does not suffice as a fully acceptable explanation, because the knowledge of this grammatical construction must include the mastery of the sentence structures. A simple mention of the culpable entity in lexical-semantic constructions is however considered fully acceptable explanation, e.g. “bekommen” in the sentence “ich möchte Arzt bekommen”,[87] since this is enough indication of what has been used inappropriately and should therefore be changed. As mentioned, key is not the memorization of the error, just evidence of analytical knowledge.

This unitary consideration of the items using the principles of retraceability potential as well as grammatical terminology means that some levels might be unrepresented in some items, as seen in the classification of the learners’ metalinguistic comments for item 1 (wir sind lesen ein Buch), which has no comments with Level 2 rating (Figure 3):

[87] The error lies in the use of “bekommen“ (further explanation in 6.9.).

Item 1: Wir sind lesen ein Buch		Rating/Level
Learners	error ID/ expalnation	
KG 1	2 verbs, verb position	3
KG 2	2 verbs, position of main verb (spielen?)	3
KG 3	Positioning of verb	1
KG 4	2 verbs, position of the verbs (lesen)	5
KG 5	wrong verb position, 2 verbs, none of which is a modal/helping verb	3
KG 6	2 verbs, verb position (lesen)	5
KG 7	2 verbs	1
KG 8	2 verbs, verb position	3
KG 9	Verb postion (lesen)	1
KG 10	2 verbs, wrong position of the verb "lesen"	5
KG 11	2 verbs (sind, lesen), verb position (lesen)	5
KG 12	2 verbs, verb position (lesen)	5
KG 13	Using "sind" and "lesen" together	0
SB 1	2 verbs following each other	1
SB 2	"2 verbs don't occur together in German"	1
SB 3	2 verbs following each other	1
SB 4	The sentence is wrong b/c it is a direct translation	1
SB 5	There are 2 verbs in the sentence	1
SB 6	2 verbs, direct translation	1
SB 7	It is a direct translation having 2 verbs	3
SB 8	One cannot have 2 verbs in a sentence unless 1 is a helping verb	5
SB 9	"There are 2 verbs following each other"	1
SB 10	"sind" and "lesen" should not be used together	0
SB 11	The word order is wrong	1
MB 1	The verb "sind"	1
MB 2	The verb "sind"	1
MB 3	The verb "sind" should not be there	5
MB 4	Use of "sind" which is irrelevant in this sentence	4
MB 5	The verb "sind"	1
MB 6	The verb "sind"	1
MB 7	The verb "sind" shouldn't be there	5
PG 1	The verb "sind" shouldn't be there	5
PG 2	The verb "sind" should not be there	5
PG 3	Verb 'lesen' on the wrong position	1
PG 4	The first verb shouldn't be there	5
PG 5	Use of the 2 verbs following each other	1
PG 6	The infinitive verb should be at the last position	1
PG 7	2 verbs are int he second position, only one is needed	3
PG 8	In the present tense, only one verb is necessary	5

Figure 4: Ratings for the learners' metalinguistic comments for Item 1

Table 3 below and the subsequent explanation gives an example of how the principles of retraceability potential as well as grammatical terminology are combined to determine acceptability of the metalinguistic comments for Item 1:

Level	Learner	Metalinguistic comment
0	SB10	"sind" and "lesen" should not be used together
1	MB 1 KG9	The verb "sind" Verb position (lesen)
3	SB7 KG1	It is a direct translation having two verbs 2 verbs, verb position
4	MB4	Use of "sind" which is irrelevant in this sentence

5	PG1 KG12	The verb “sind” should not be there 2 verbs, verb position (lesen)

Table 3: Example- Metalinguistic comments rating for the item "wir sind lesen ein Buch"

SB10’s comment *“sind” and “lesen” should not be used together* got the lowest rating (Level 0) as it seems to suggest that the separation of the two words would correct the error. It also contains no grammatical terminology.

MB1’s explanation *The verb sind* got a Level 1 rating because there is no further information of what is wrong with the named verb, also not what should be done to the verb to correct the error. The learner however uses the correct term for the grammatical category, hence earning an extra point. KG9’s *Verb position (lesen)* also got the same rating because it seems to suggest that simply shifting the position of the verb would correct the error.

KG1’s *2 verbs, verb position* insinuates that the presence of the two verbs is deviant, which shows some awareness of the grammatical requirement for constructions expressing the present tense in standard German. The learner however does not point out which of the verbs should remain in what position, hence the “partly acceptable rating”. The same can be said of SB7’s *It is a direct translation having two verbs*, in addition to his awareness for cross-linguistic influence, which he is seen to blame for the presence of two verbs, although he falls short of clarifying which of the two verbs should be done away with.

MB4’s *Use of “sind” which is irrelevant in this sentence* clearly points out to what is causing the error and what should be done to correct it, even without the use of grammatical terminology, hence the totally acceptable rating.

In line with the principle of high retraceability potential and appropriate grammatical terminology, PG1’s explanation *The verb “sind” should not be there* gets a higher rating, since it makes it clear that the presence of the verb “sind” is the problem, and that’s it’s removal would correct the sentence. She also uses the term “verb”, while MB4 does not. KG12’s *2 verbs, verb position (lesen)* is also rated as fully acceptable (Level 5) because unlike KG1’s *verbs, verb position*

(rated Level 3), the learner indicates that the verb "lesen" should remain and shift position in order to correct the error.

5.6.3. Relating acceptability to metalinguistic knowledge

As discussed above, comments in Level 0 and 1 are rated as unacceptable, in that they cannot in any way be reconstructed to offer the means of correcting the presented error (low retraceability potential). Level 1 comments contain some grammatical terminology, but the explanation offers no pointers to what should be altered to correct the error. Comments in Levels 2 and 3 while largely acceptable are too generalized or imprecise, and their pointers to what should be altered to correct the errors are too vague (average retraceability potential). Levels 4 and 5 contain comments that offer sufficient explanation of the error, in that they clearly indicate what should be done to rectify the error. Each level is consequently regarded as a reflection of the state of the development of the metalinguistic knowledge in the specific context, hence:

5.7. Content of the analysis

All the 20 items of the UGJT were transferred onto the Excel-sheets as shown in 5.3. and subjected to a pre-analysis evaluation. 11 items into the evaluation, recurrent patterns in the learners handling of the errors were observable, which evidenced the learners' tendencies in dealing with morphosyntactic and lexical-semantic errors, as well as patterns in making the cross-linguistic connections. Accordingly, the analysis is limited to the learners' responses to those 11 items.

An explication of the linguistic explanation of the errors accompanies every item, as detailed in the following chapter:

- Item 1: Wir sind lesen ein Buch
- Item 2: Du isst was?
- Item 3: Ich gehe nicht in die Schule weil ich bin krank
- Item 4: Er kann spielen Fußball
- Item 5: Mein Bruder hat gekocht Ugali
- Item 6: Ich habe eine Katze. Es heißt Mai
- Item 7: Ich bin Junge/Ich bin Mädchen
- Item 8: Wir schlafen in Schule
- Item 9: Es möchte regnen
- Item 10: ich habe Deutsch seit dre jahren gelesen
- Item 11: Ich möchte Arzt bekommen

5.8. Conclusion

In this chapter, the conceptualisation and analytical approach to the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test as an empirical tool was discussed, bringing together the concepts of language awareness, metalinguistic knowledge as well as excerpts from the Kenyan sociolinguistic space linking multilinguality to cross-linguistic influence.

The analytical approach developed also adds to the on-going discussion on the operationalization and validity of grammaticality tests (Ellis & Loewen, 2007; Gutiérrez, 2013; Isemonger, 2007; Vafaee, Suzuki, & Kachisnke, 2017), by introducing the constructs of the retraceability potential and mastery of grammatical terminology as determinants of acceptability in the qualitative assessment of learners' metalinguistic comments. These constructs are the guidelines used in the data analysis in the following chapter.

6. METALINGUISTIC KNOWLEDGE AND THE AWARENESS OF THE CROSS-LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH AND KISWAHILI ON GERMAN

Introduction

In this section, the outcome of the leaners' examination of the grammatical errors (understood as metalinguistic comments) are analysed using the criteria discussed in chapter 5. This exercise aims at establishing the nature and status of the learners' metalinguistic knowledge, by assessing how the learners apply it on grammatical errors in Standard German that can be traced to the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili. The examples given in the metalinguistic rating scale are representative of the explanations classified under the specific levels, and are copied as written by the learners.

6.1. Item 1: Wir sind lesen ein Buch

6.1.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

The sentence "wir sind lesen ein Buch", by having both verbs "sind" and "lesen" deviates from the defined rules of forming the present tense in standard German. The Present tense in German is used to express different time frames depending on the contextualization, including the present, the future, the historic present past (Durrell & Hammer, 2002, pp. 292–295; Gallmann, Sitta, Geipel, & Wagner, 2013, p. 65; Imo, 2016).

The learners of German who took part in this study are still at the beginners' level of learning German as a foreign language. For them, the present tense in German is used to express the simple present tense, the present progressive tense, as well as the future. The sentence "wir lesen ein Buch" (which would be the grammatically acceptable option) has the meaning of "We read a book"/"we are reading a book"/and "we will read a book", depending on the context. Durrell clarifies that German does not have progressive tenses (Durrell & Hammer, 2002, p. 304), so the grammatically correct answer to the question "was macht

ihr (gerade)" (what are you doing (now)) would be "wir lesen ein Buch" (we are reading a book), without the auxiliary "to be"[88].

Since many learners said that they use translation from English into German as a learning strategy, it is conceivable that they do a one-to-one translation, by adding the auxiliary "sind" to fit the familiar English structure, i.e.:

We	are	reading	a	book
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Wir	sind	lesen	ein	Buch

6.1.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalinguistic rating scale

The rating of the learners' explanation of the error using the metalinguistic rating scale are presented in table 4:

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	2 (5%)	- KG1: *Using "sind" and "lesen" together* - SB10: *"Sind" and "lesen" should not be used together.*
Level 1	18 (46%)	- KG7: *Two verbs* - KG9: *Verb position (lesen)* - SB1: *2 verbs following each other* - SB4: *The sentence is wrong because it is a direct translation* - SB11: *The word order is wrong* - MB5: *The verb "sind"* - PG3: *The verb "lesen" on the wrong position* - PG6: *The infinitive verb should be in the last position*
Level 2	----	
Level 3	6 (15%)	- KG1: *2 verbs, verb position* - SB7: *it is a direct translation having two verbs* - PG7: *2 verbs are in the second position, only one is needed*

[88] In English, the question "What are you doing now" would be answered using the present progressive tense, which is formed with the present form of "be" as an auxiliary and the gerund of the main verb (-ing ending) hence "We are reading a book"

Level 4	1 (3%)	- MB4: *Use of "sind" which is irrelevant in this case*
Level 5	12 (31%)	- KG10: *2 verbs, position of the verb "lesen"* - PG8: *In the present tense, only one verb is necessary,* - PG4: *The first verb shouldn't be there,* - SB8: *One cannot have two verbs in a sentence unless one is a helping verb* - MB7*: The verb "sind" should not be there*

Table 4: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "wir sind lesen ein Buch"

The phrase "wir sind ein Buch lesen" tested the learners' explicit knowledge in forming the simple present tense in the German language. By using the retraceability potential and grammatical terminology to determine acceptability, comments from 20 learners received a Level 0 (5%) and Level 1 (46%) rating, which indicates underdeveloped metalinguistic knowledge of the grammatical rules governing the construction of the present tense in standard German. However, out of the 39 participants were unable to correct the error. The explanations given by these 5 were rated at level 1, which, as summarized below, shows a correlation between the underdeveloped metalinguistic knowledge and poor performance:

Learner	**error explanation**	**attempt at error correction**
KG3:	positioning of the verb	Wir sind ein Buch lesen
KG9:	verb position (lesen)	Wir sind ein Buch lesen
SB 6:	2 verbs, direct translation	Wir lesen ein Buch sind
PG3:	The verb 'lesen' is in the wrong position	Wir sind ein Buch lesen
PG6:	The infinitive verb should be at the last position	Wir sind ein Buch lesen

It is not clear if all the other learners who were able to correct the error (although their explanations of the violated rule were rated as unacceptable) consulted with their fellow learners,[89] or whether these learners in the process of internalizing the rules of grammar –such that they are able to apply them to make grammatical constructions- somehow lost the ability to express the explicit

[89] There was no strict supervision during the test

rules learnt.[90] While studies postulate that explicit and metalinguistic knowledge is learnable (Ellis, 2004, p. 240), the observable behaviour here raises the question of whether explicit knowledge can be unlearned/lost with internalization.

6.1.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

In making the cross-linguistic connection between the presented error and English and Kiswahili, 90% of the learners traced the error back to influence from English, with a majority citing the direct translation of the sentence *we are reading a book* as the cause of the error. The few exemptions who gave a different explanation include MB4's *it is in the form of English 'we are reading a book,* which could be construed as the adherence to the English syntactical structure in construction the given item, or as a literal translation. PG6 also explicitly mentions *English sentence structure* as the cause of the error, showing an awareness of grammatical constructions in both languages.

Only 4 (10%) learners put forward the influence of both English and Kiswahili as the cause of the error, citing the direct translation of the sentences "we are reading a book" and "tunasoma kitabu" into German as the cause of the error, which is also plausible if one does a one - to - one translation:

Tu	-na	-soma	()	kitabu
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
We	are	reading	a	book
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Wir	sind	lesen	ein	buch

That only such a small number of learners see a parallel to the Kiswahili structure enforces the position of the enhanced psychotypology of English and German among the Kenyan learners of German (Cenoz, 2001; Kellerman, 2001; Ringbom, 2001); Although both English and Kiswahili follow a similar structure in the construction of the present progressive tense, English is closer to German in the case of the syntactical combinatorial possibilities, since both require that the noun is accompanied by an indefinite article (a book/ein Buch), while

[90] Further discussion in 6.12.6

Kiswahili does not. The learners' awareness of this similarity explains their choice of English as the bridge or base language (Chandrasekhar, 1978; De Angelis, 2007, pp. 19–39; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998).

6.2. Item 2. Du isst was?

6.2.1 Linguistic explanation of the error

The phrase "Du isst was?" contravenes the syntactical rules of the interrogative in standard German, which require that "[t]he question begins with the interrogative word (Position I) followed by the conjugated verb (Position II) and the subject (Position III or IV whichever the case may be)"(Dreyer & Schmitt, 2008, p. 96). The phrase however begins with the subject (Du), followed by the conjugated verb (isst) and then the interrogative (was) comes in the last position. This construction is contrary to the instructions given in the course book Safari Deutsch Band I (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009a, pp. 62–66).

English, one of the two languages established as having most influence on the production of German among Kenyan learners, also tends to abide to the syntactical arrangement of interrogative word-conjugated verb-subject (Nelson & Greenbaum, 2016, p. 125). Kiswahili, on the other hand, allows the placement of the interrogative at the end of the question, as Zawawi explains, "interrogatives may appear at the beginning or the end of a question depending on the emphasis (Zawawi, 1995, p. 20). This points to influence of Kiswahili as the source of the error.

Explanations given by learners were evaluated according to the principles of retraceabiltiy potential and grammatical terminology, and a majority were rated as acceptable on the metalinguistic rating scale shown in table 5 below:

6.2.2 Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalinguistic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	1 (3%)	SB 10 (Blank space)
Level 1	2 (5%)	- KG7: *verb* - SB3: *Questions do not begin with nouns*

Level 2	3 (8%)	- MB4: *Conjugation is wrong, sentence arrangement is wrong* - *MB7: Wrong conjugation, wrong sentence arrangement* - MB2: *Arrangement of the words in the sentence*
Level 3	8 (20%)	- KG9: *Sentence structure* - MB5: *Word order*
Level 4	4 (10%)	- KG3: *It should start with "was"* - KG12: *"Was" placed in the wrong position* - KG1: *Position of the question "was"* - KG11: *Question form is wrong, "was" placed in the wrong position*
Level 5	21 (54%)	- KG2: *Position of the 'W' Wort* - SB2: *The Interrogative should come at the beginning* - PG2: *Wrong sentence structure. The question word should take the first position* - PG1*: The question word is in the last position* - PG8*: Question words should start a sentence apart from when used as conjunctions*

Table 5: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Du isst was?"

Going by the principle of retraceability potential, the highest rated comments should make it explicit that the error lies in the position of the interrogative word, and make use of grammatical terminology e.g. Interrogative, interrogative word, question word (used in the course book Safari Deutsch I) (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009a, p. 63) etc. to refer to the wrongly placed entity. Explanations given by 25 learners, representing more than half of the study participants exhibited highly developed metalinguistic knowledge in the grammatical constructions of questions using interrogatives (Level 4 - 10%, Level 5 - 54%). Furthermore, all the participants apart from 2 rewrote the phrase correctly, reinforcing the question that arose in Item 1, that of the learners' inability to explain the error despite having explicitly learnt the grammatical rules, but being able to correct it.

The explanations given by the two learners whose attempts to correct the error were unsuccessful; MB4's *Conjugation is wrong, sentence arrangement is wrong*

and MB7's *The conjugation and sentence arrangement is wrong* received a Level 2 rating due to the reference to conjugation. Their explanation points to insufficient semantic processing (Ellis, 2004), which might have arisen due to the orthographic and phonetic similarities of the verbs "isst" (2nd and 3rd person conjugation of the verb "essen" in the present tense) and "ist" (3rd person conjugation of the verb "sein" in the present tense. Both learners then trace the error to the Kiswahili phrase *wewe ni nani?.* Their attempt to correct the phrase however results in a lexical-semantic error *Was bist du?,* which reinforces the postulation of deficient semantic processing; also seeing that the learners equate the Kiswahili interrogative "wewe" in to the German "was", instead of the more appropriate "wer". This mix-up also points to the need to sensitize the learners on homophones, as seen in the case of "isst" and "ist".

6.2.3. Making the cross-Linguistic connection

As expected, all subjects attributed the error to cross-linguistic influence of Kiswahili, with 28 participants giving direct translation of the question *'Unakula nini?* as the cause of then error. 3 learners point to the transfer of the Kiswahili sentence structure into German as the cause of then error. Both explanations are based on the structure of the Kiswahili language, which generally requires that the interrogative is in the last position in a sentence/question.

While many learners of German do not seem to think that their knowledge of Kiswahili influences their German,[91] there has been evidence of cross-linguistic transfer at the morpho-syntactic level that can be traced back to Kiswahili (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012; Hinga, 2015). In the course of working with learners of German as a foreign language especially the beginner classes at the Goethe Institut Nairobi, we (my colleagues and I) encounter several instances of this relocation of the interrogative to the last position construction in German.

The presumption has been that the error is fossilized in the learners' English. Buregeya has extensively discussed the influence of Kenyan languages on the English language among Kenyans), which then leads to its being transferred onto

[91] See chapter 4.

the German language (from English) (Buregeya, 2006). The participants of this study, however, when confronted with the error, trace it back to Kiswahili, skipping English altogether, meaning that they recognize the subject-verb-interrogative construction as erroneous even in English; which implies an awareness of multileveled cross-linguistic influence. The question, then, is why the erroneous construction persists in both English and in German.

6.3. Item 3: Er kann spielen Fußball

6.3.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

According to Dreyer & Schmitt, the conjugated modal verb is placed in the second position in the present and the imperfect tense while the full verb takes the last position in its infinitive form (Dreyer & Schmitt, 2008, p. 102; Eckhard-Black & Whittle, 1992, p. 65). The sentence "Er kann spielen Fußball", therefore, does not abide by the syntactical rules of standard German, since the main verb takes the third place, instead of the last place.

The English language, however, places the main verb right after the modal verb, hence the subject→modal verb→full verb structure (Carter & McCarthy, 2006, p. 639). Given that the study's participants have singled out translation from English into German as one of the strategies they use they learn German, then the possibility of the transfer of the familiar English structure onto German is a possible cause of the error. The rating of the learners' explanations of the error are presented in table 6 below:

6.3.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalinguistic using scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	1 (3%)	KG13: Blank spaces
Level 1	4 (10%)	- SB3: *Wrong word order, noun and verb* - SB11: *The accusative should come first before the verb* - PG1: *The verb "spielen" has been wrongly conjugated*
Level 2	1(3%)	- MB4: *The sentence is wrongly arranged*

Level 3	10 (25%)	- KG3: *Wrong verb position* - SB6: *Direct translation* - MB5: *Word order* - PG4: *Sentence structure*
Level 4	2 (5%)	- SB8: *"Fußball" and "spielen" have been interchanged* - SB10: *"Spielen" should come at the end*
Level 5	22 (56%)	- KG1: *Infinitiv verb position* - KG4: *2 verbs verb position (spielen)* - PG1: *The verb spielen is wrongly positioned* - SB2: *"Spielen" should come at the end since a modal verb has been used* - MB3: *The verb "spielen" should be at the end* - PG5: *When using a modal verb, the main verb is put in the last position*

Table 6: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Er kann spielen Fußball"

This item tested the learners' knowledge of the syntactic rules of using the modal verbs in the German language. In line with the retraceability potential approach, the highest rated metalinguistic comments must indicate that "spielen" is in the wrong position, and make use of the grammatical terminology verb in its reference. Explanations from 24 participants making up 22% (Level 5) and 2% (Level 4) of the participants were deemed to exhibit well-developed metalinguistic knowledge related the grammatical constructions using modal verbs.

The comments classified as exhibiting relatively well-developed metalinguistic knowledge with regard to the syntactical requirements of the German language with regard to modal verbs (level 2 (3%) and Level 3 (25%)) include explanations like *sentence is wrongly arranged, sentence structure,* and *word order,* which fall short due to their generality; since they do not indicate which part of the sentence is in the wrong position. The same is seen in KG11's *2 verbs (kann and spielen) wrong verb position*, as well SB5's *The verb comes at the end of the sentence*, in which it is not clear which of the two verbs is in the wrong position. Compare that to KG10's *2 verbs, verb position (spielen)*, which clearly indicates that the verb "spielen" should be moved, hence the Level 5 rating.

Only two learners are unable to correct the error, and it is no wonder that there is a correspondence between the low rating of their explanations and their unacceptable reformulations:

Learner	error explanation	attempt at error correction
MB2:	Two verbs are following each other	Er spielen Fußball
PG1:	The verb "spielen has been wrongly conjugated	Er kann spielt Fußball.

The question of the inability to explain the error while being able to correct it keeps coming up, this time with SB11 whose explanation *The accusative should come first before the verb* is rated as totally unacceptable.

6.3.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

Most of the learners (30) attributed the error to the influence of English on German, explicitly citing the direct translation of the sentence "He can play football" as the cause of the error. 2 learners SB1 and SB are not explicit about what the explanation is, but give the sentence "He is playing football", leading to the inference that they also see its literal translation as the cause of the error in German. 2 learners: SB8 *It follows the same structure as English "He can play football"* and PG2 *Direct translation/English sentence structure: "He can play football"* are also seen to exhibit awareness of German-English intersyntactical influence.

For 5 learners, the error can be traced back to the cross-linguistic influence from English and Kiswahili. They cited the direct translation of the sentences "He can play football" and "anaweza kucheza mpira" as causing the error in German. SB3: and PG7 cited the direct translation of the Kiswahili sentences "Yeye anaweza kucheza kandanda" and "anaweza kucheza kandanda". Although the Kiswahili syntax also requires the placement of the main verb immediately after the modal verb, it also requires that the modal verb is modulated using a tense marker, thereby making a one to one agreement of English and Kiswahili impossible. This raises the question of the learners' knowledge about the Kiswahili grammar, and what they mean by "direct translation".

A	-na	-weza	kucheza	mpira/Kandanda
(Subject)	*(tense marker)*	*(modal verb)*	*(main verb)*	*(direct object)*
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Er	(ist)	kann	spielen	Fußball.

6.4. Item 4: Ich gehe nicht in die Schule, weil ich bin krank

6.4.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

In standard German,"weil" is identified as a subordinating conjunction, whose usage requires placing the conjugated (finite) verb at the end of the subordinate clause (Dodd, 2004, p. 11; Eckhard-Black & Whittle, 1992, p. 137). In colloquial and spoken German, however, there is a tendency to place the conjugated verb at the second rather than the last position, but as Durrell states, this is, "[…] universally regarded as substandard and felt to be quite unacceptable in written German" (Durrell & Hammer, 2002, p. 411). The course book used in the teaching of German as foreign language in Kenyan Secondary schools adhere to the "conjugated verb at the end of the sentence" rule (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009b, pp. 47–50).

"Weil" largely answers the question "warum" (why). For learners of German who use English as the base language, it is equated to "because", which is also a subordinating conjunction (Carter & McCarthy, 2006, p. 57). The syntax of the English language, however, does not require the placement of the conjugate verb on the last position.

In Kiswahili, the other language of the learners, "weil" is equivalent to "kwa sababu", a subordinate marker giving a sense of reason (Mohamed, 2001, p. 246). Although the sentence structure of the subordinate and main clauses in Kiswahili is quite flexible, the subordinate clauses of purpose usually follow the main verb, unless they are the topic of the entire sentence.[92]

Given that these are the two languages have been evidenced as being most influential in the German of Kenyan learners, then it is plausible that the learners

[92] (Mohamed, 2001, p. 247) The subordinate clauses of purpose, reason and volition follow the main verb, e.g. Baba alinipiga kwa kuwa nilivunja vikombe.

transfer the subordinate sentence structure from English and Kiswahili onto German resulting in the error.

6.4.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalinguistic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	3 (8%)	- KG3: *Wrong choice of words* - MB2: *Use of Weil* - MB6: *ich bin*
Level 1	3 (8%)	- SB6: *Direct translation* - MB4: *Translation from Kiswahili*
Level 2	3 (8%)	- KG7: *Using "in die" instead of "zur" and placing "bin" in the wrong position* - MB1: *The position of the word "bin"*
Level 3	18 (46%)	- KG1: *Verb position* - KG6: *Verb ist nicht am Ende* - SB4: *The sentence structure is wrong* - MB3: *The verb "bin" should be at the end* - MB5: *Use of weil, word order* - PG4: *Sentence structure in the subordinate clause*
Level 4	2 (5%)	- SB8: *The position of "bin" and "krank" have been interchanged* - SB10: *"bin" should go to the end of the sentence*
Level 5	10 (25%)	- SB1: *The verb "bin" in the subordinate clause should come at the end* - SB9: *When using "weil", the conjugated verb goes to the end* - PG8: *The verb in the subordinate clause should be at the end* - SB5: *The conjugated verb on the side of the subordinate clause should be at the end* - PG2: *When using a subordinate conjunction, the verb in the subordinate clause takes the last position*

Table 7: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "ich gehe nicht in die Schule weil ich bin krank"

This item tested the learners' awareness of the rules governing the construction of subordinate clauses involving the causal conjunction "weil" in the German language. To receive the highest ranking, an explanation would have to show evidence of this knowledge, according to the criterion of retraceability potential.

The explanation would also have to contain acceptable grammatical terminology, in this case subordinate clause, verb, conjugate verb, conjunction etc. Only 25% of the total explanations met this condition to receive the highest rating (Level 5).

A majority of the explanations (46%) exhibit relatively well-developed metalinguistic knowledge of the grammatical constructions of subordinate clauses. Many made reference to the verb "bin" being in the wrong position, but did not specify whether it is in the main or in the subordinate clause. While explanations like *word order* or *sentence structure* indicate an awareness of a syntactical deviation, they are not precise in pinpointing the exact cause of the error and what should be done to correct it, evidenced in their attempts at error connection (See SB4 below).

Learner/Level	**error explanation**	**attempt at error correction**
SB4 (L3)	The sentence structure is wrong	Ich gehe nicht in die Schule Weil bin ich krank
SB6 (L1)	Direct translation	Ich gehe nicht in die Schule weil ich krank ist
MB2 (L0)	Use of Weil	Ich gehe nicht in die Schule obwohl ich krank bin
MB6 (L0)	"ich bin"	Ich gehe nicht in die Schule weil bin ich krank
PG1 (L3)	The verb "bin"	Ich nicht in dies Schule gehe, weil ich krank bin

It is therefore not surprising that the 5 failed attempts at correcting the error come from learners whose comments received lower level ratings, showing a correlation between the inability to explain the error and the inability to correct it (explicit knowledge and performance). The question of the inability to explain the error while being able to correct it still persists.

6.4.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

All the participants were able to identify the cross-linguistic influence from English and Kiswahili, with 25 tracing the error back to English, 9 from both

English and Kiswahili, and 5 from Kiswahili into German. Most of the subjects give the direct translation of the subordinate clause "because I am sick" (English) and "kwa sababu mimi ni mgonjwa/nimeugua" (Kiswahili). With "direct translation", the learners refer to the complete superimposition of the German words over the Kiswahili and English words, so that the syntax of these languages is transferred to German. In doing so, the resulting sentence in German deviates from the syntactical rules of the Standard German language:

because	I	am	sick	(English)
↓	↓	↓	↓	
kwa sababu	mimi	ni	mgonjwa	(Kiswahili)
↓	↓	↓	↓	
, weil	ich	bin	krank	(German)

The learners' ability to draw these parallels from both English and Kiswahili shows an awareness of the syntactic requirements of using the causal conjunctions in English, Kiswahili and how the direct transfer of these structures can cause errors in German. They also point to the learner' awareness of the syntactical differences between English, Kiswahili, and German, which is a crucial aspect of multilingual language learning awareness.

6.5. Item 5: Ich bin Mädchen/ich bin Junge

6.5.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

Agoya-Wotsuna (2012) while discussing the manifestations of morphosyntactic transfer amongst Kenyan learners of German, observed that the learners tended to leave out both the definite and indefinite articles in their German constructions. She attributes this transfer to the influence of English; due to the typological similarities between the two languages. She then introduces the hypothesis that the influence could also stem from other languages present in the linguistic repertoire of these learners, most notably Bantu languages like Kiswahili.

Definite and indefinite articles also accompany nouns in German, just like in the English language. While English uses "the" as the definite article, German has 3 forms depending on the gender of the noun: "der" for masculine, "die" for

feminine, “das” for neuter, and “die” for plural. English uses “a” and “an” as the indefinite articles, while German has “ein” for masculine, “eine” for feminine, and “ein” for neuter. These articles (in German) are declined in line with the various grammatical contexts e.g. case (accusative, dative).

“Ich bin Mädchen/Ich bin Junge”, deviates from the prescribed rules of standard German. This construction requires an indefinite article “ein”, which correlates with the neuter noun “Mädchen” and the masculine noun “Junge”, to read “Ich bin ein Mädchen”/”Ich bin ein Junge”. The English version of this sentence would also require an article: “I am a girl”/”I am a boy”.

In German, the indefinite article is omitted when affiliating people to their nationality, religion and profession (Dreyer & Schmitt, 2008, p. 19). After learning “Ich bin Kenianer/in” (I am a Kenyan), “Ich bin Schüler/in” (I am a student”) etc., this error could be caused by an overgeneralization of this rule/false analogy (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, p. 65). It could stem from the influence of Kiswahili, whose construction does not require the use of articles:

Mimi	ni	msichana	/	Mimi	ni	mvulana
↓	↓	↓		↓	↓	↓
Ich	bin	Mädchen	/	Ich	bin	Junge

In their engagement with this item, the learners show their knowledge of the grammatical structures involving indefinite articles in English, Kiswahili, and German.

6.5.2. Classification of the learners’ explanations using the metalinguistic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	7 (18%)	- Blank spaces - KB7: *Using ich bin Mädch*en… (unintelligible) - MB4: *Sentence arrangement*
Level 1	3 (8%)	- KG5: *The nouns lack prepositions yet they talk about the first person* - KG11: *“Mädchen” and “Junge” are in plural, supposed to be in singular*

		- MB7: *The verb "eine" is missing*
Level 2	------	- ----
Level 3	--------	- ----
Level 4	1 (3%)	- SB10: *"ein" has been omitted*
Level 5	28 (71%)	- KG1: *Artikel fehlt* - SB5: *There's no article* - SB1: *The nouns 'Mädchen' and 'Junge' are not preceded by articles* - PG4: *Omission of articles* - MB3: *The indefinite article is not used* - MB6: *Lack of article "ein"*

Table 8: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Ich bin Mädchen/ich bin Junge"

This item aimed at testing the learners' knowledge of indefinite articles as they are used in the German language. The key to the highest rating, therefore, lay in the identification of the missing article as the cause of the error. With regard to grammatical terminology, it was sufficient to make reference to "article". A vast majority of learners seem to have mastered this phenomenon, as 71% of the explanations received a Level 5 rating.

There were 3 Level 1 ratings (8%), and in 2 explanations (KG5: *The nouns lack prepositions yet they talk about the first person* and MB7: *The verb "eine" is missing*), the importance of the mastery of grammatical terminology becomes highlighted.

In correcting the error, almost all the learners include an indefinite article in their corrections. However, most of them have the article inflected wrongly (eine Mädchen, einen Junge[93]), pointing to the need for more practice. There are only 2 totally unsuccessful correction attempts, which reflect the learners' explanations for the error: KG11 *Mädchen and Junge are in plural, they are supposed to be in singular* leads to the construction *ich bin ein Jung/wir sind Junge, Ich bin eine Mädche/wir sind Mädchen,* showing the need for consciousness raising with regard to nouns in German; and MB7's explanation *sentence arrangement* and his

[93] "Mädchen" takes the neuter gender, hence the inflection of the indefinite article in the nominative case as "ein", "Junge" takes the masculine gender, hence the inflection of the indefinite article in the nominative case as "ein": ich bin ein Mädchen/ich bin ein Junge.

consequent attempt at correction *Junge bin ich*, which points to deficient syntactical awareness.

6.5.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

By asking the learners to trace the cross-linguistic influence of this error, the item aimed at testing the learners' awareness of the similarities and differences of the use of indefinite articles in English, Kiswahili, and German. In doing so, they also exhibit their knowledge about these languages. 31 learners gave the direct translation from the Kiswahili sentences "mimi ni msichana and mimi ni mvulana" as the cause of the error; the word-for-word translations of which would lead to the omission of the article in the German language, as Kiswahili does not require it. This points to the learners' knowledge of the syntactical structure of Kiswahili as well as their ability draw the connection between the errors they make in German and Kiswahili, despite the assertions that Kiswahili does not influence their German.

Only 3 learners think that the error is caused by influence of English: KG3 posits that the error stems from the direct translation from the English phrase "I am a girl". Seeing that she gives *no article* as the explanation for the error, then it is clear that she does not know that "a" is an indefinite article in English. Although metalinguistic knowledge "includes knowledge of general principles applicable to more than one language" (Roehr-Brackin, 2018, pp. 1–2), this instance shows that it is not necessarily always the case. This also points to the state of explicit grammatical knowledge about English among the learners

MB7, on the other hand, exhibits insufficient knowledge of both grammatical terminology (see 6.5.2.) and English syntax. He gives the translation "Am boy/girl" as the cause of error; omitting both the subject (I) and the article (a). SB6's position that the error stems from the translation of the phrase "I am male/I am female" also shows a deficit in the knowledge of the semantic relationships in German and English: "Junge" (boy) does not translate to "male" in English; it is only its hyponym. This insufficient knowledge of and about English, the language that learners of German use as the base language, definitely inhibits the learning of German as a foreign language.

6.6. Item 6: Wir schlafen in Schule

6.6.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

Item 6 (Wir schlafen in Schule) is another common error made by Kenyan learners of German, which involves use of articles. As mentioned, this was also part of Agoya-Wotsuna's findings on transfer at the morpho-syntactical level. She singles out the omission of definite articles in the constructions "ich wohne in Innenstadt" and "wir sind in Schule (gewesen)", and traces these errors to literal/word-for-word translation of the English phrases: I live in town, we were in school. Her explanation was that learners use English as an orientation resource in German, due to the typological similarities of the two languages. Her thesis was reinforced by the overwhelming reference to the facilitative role of English in the learning of German by the learners who participated in this study.[94]

This item tested the learners' knowledge of the use of articles in the German language, and how it differs from the English language. This construction requires the declension of the feminine article "die" into "der", so as to agree with the dative case that is used with the preposition "in" denoting location.[95, 96] The English language, however, has instances where the use of an article is not compulsory, this being one of them. This phrase is often seen when Kenyan learners discuss life in Kenyan (boarding) schools. The English construction "we sleep in school" suffices. This being the case, it is conceivable that some learners transfer this construction to German, omitting the definite article "der", hence the error.

[94] See chapter 4
[95] Prepositions answering interrogatives "wo?" and "wohin" are covered in the second year of learning German as a foreign language (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009b, pp. 105–123).
[96] The grammatical form is "wir schlafen in der Schule".

6.6.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalinguistic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	8 (20.5%)	- Blank space - KG1: *Wrong use of "in"* - MB4: *Bad vocabulary* - PG2: *It doesn't make sense grammatically*
Level 1	8 (20.5%)	- KG5: *Omission of a preposition* - MB2: *No pronoun "sind"* - MB7: *The verb "schlafen" should be at the end* - PG5: *Use of the wrong verb 'schlafen'*
Level 2	-----	- -----
Level 3	1 (3%)	- KG8: *Direct translation*
Level 4	2 (5%)	- KG7: *Did not include "der Schule"* - SB10: *"der" has been omitted*
Level 5	20 (51%)	- KG2: *Omitting articles (the)* - KG6: No article - SB1: The word "Schule" should be preceded by an article - PG1: *The article for "Schule" is missing"* - KG12: *Omitting Artikel*

Table 9: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "wir schlafen in Schule"

Just like in Item 5, this item sought to test the learners' awareness of the use of articles in the German language and how it differs from English and Kiswahili. The focus in this case was definite articles. 51% of the explanations making reference to the missing article were considered as exhibiting well developed metalinguistic knowledge of this grammatical requirement, and received a Level 5 rating.

By attributing the error to the use of the verb "schlafen", explanations from PG5, PG6, PG7, PG8 exhibit inability to engage in semantic processing, the first of the three principal processing operations required to perform a metalinguistic judgement test, hence the Level 1 rating. The fact that these are all learners from one school poses the question as to whether the teacher input might have contributed to the viewpoint that the verb "schlafen" is inappropriate when referring life in the boarding schools. Looking at their attempts at correcting the error, they all make reference to the boarding school: PG5: *Wir sind in eine*

Internatschule, PG6: *Wir sind in Internatschule*, PG7: *Wir wohnen in der Schule*, PG8: *Wir sind in eine Internatschule*. Given that the notion of the boarding school involves sleeping there, their rejection of the verb "schlafen" is confounding.

Deficient grammatical terminology is exhibited by KG5's *Omission of a preposition*, then her addition of an article in the correction (wir schlafen in die Schule), meaning that the learner does not know that "die" is an article. MB2 gives *No pronoun "sind"*, whereas "sind" is a declension of the verb "sein".[97] His subsequent attempt at correcting the error unveils further insufficiency of grammatical knowledge, as his construction (wir sind in die Schule schlafen) contains even more syntactic deviations.[98] Still on under-developed grammatical knowledge, the fact that many learners gave "wir schlafen in die Schule" as the correction of the error means that they still have not mastered the declension of the articles depending on the grammatical cases.

6.6.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

A majority of the subjects (29) traced the error back to influence from English on German, all of the giving the word for word translation of the phrase "we sleep in school" as the cause of the error. This is in line with Agoya-Wotsuna's advancement discussed earlier, which alludes to the learners' psychotypology of English and German, the former serving as the base language. English, compared to the other languages in the Kenyan learners' linguistic repertoire is typologically closer to German, with both being Germanic languages (Harbert, 2006). These similarities can be used as resources to enhance the German language learning process. There, however, exists differences in the two languages, attention to which the learners should be drawn, so as to avoid blanket summations and transfers, which will in turn lead to errors like this. The participants of this study, by tracing the error to this translation, exhibit awareness of the cross-linguistic influence from English.

[97] "Sind" is the declension of the verb "sein" in the polite form (Singular, Plural), as well as the 1st person and 3rd person plural.
[98] "sind" has been treated like a modal verb, whose use in a sentence requires that the non-finite verb is moved to the last position.

10 learners trace the error back to cross-linguistic influence from Kiswahili to German, giving the direct translation of the phrase "tunalala shuleni" as the cause of then error. As has been observed so far, "direct translation" is used to mean the word for word replacement for words from another language with German words (e.g. we sleep in School- wir schlafen in Schule). Giving then same explanation for Kiswahili phrases does not quite fit, given the structural differences between the phrases in the two languages, especially given the agglutinative nature of Kiswahili: "Tunalala Shuleni" "Tu-" is the subject prefix denoting plural, "-na-" is the tense marker denoting the present tense, "-lala" is the verb stem for the verb "kulala", which means "to sleep". "Shuleni" takes the locative suffix "-ni" to signal location (Mohamed, 2001; Zawawi, 1995). The literal translation for this in German would therefore be "wir sind schlafen Schule in". That these subjects draw this conclusion exhibits insufficient knowledge of the morphological structure of Kiswahili.

This observation is reinforced by the phrase given by KG2, KG4, KG5, KG7, KG12, and MB4: *Tunalala shule*, a construction that deviates from the rules of standard Kiswahili, but is common in colloquial Kiswahili use. It is therefore not expected in the formal school setting, especially not in the written form. This points to the permeation of the informal varieties of Kiswahili into the classroom, contrary to arguments that Standard Kiswahili retains an elevated position in the school and classroom context (See Wairungu, 2014, pp. 161–180). It also means that the line between formal and informal language use in Kenya is getting even more blurred, prompting the question of the development of the learners' academic language proficiency (Cummins, 2008). The inability to separate colloquial from formal language use is seen as a manifestation of "language unawareness", an aspect that is discussed further in section 6.12.4.

6.7. Item 7: Mein Bruder hat gekocht ugali[99]

6.7.1. Linguistic explanation for the error

The perfect tense in Standard German is formed by combining either "haben" or "sein" as auxiliaries[100] with a main verb. The auxiliary is used in its conjugate

[99] A typical Kenyan maize flour staple.

form in the present tense while the main verb is used in its past participle form. The auxiliary takes the second position while the participle takes the last position. The phrase "Mein Bruder hat gekocht Ugali" places the participle (gekocht) in the third position, thereby contravening the morpho-syntactic rules of Standard German. The learners who took part in this study have already learnt this construction, as it is covered in Lektion 9 and 10 of the course book Safari Deutsch Band II (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009b).

Comparing German and English, one of the other language of these learners, there are similarities as well as differences in the use and construction of the perfect tense (See Dodd, 2004, pp. 72–73; Eckhard-Black & Whittle, 1992, p. 61). Focusing on the construction, both use an auxiliary as well as a past participle, however, there is a syntactical difference brought about by the placement of the past participle; since it immediately follows the auxiliary in the English language. A learner of German using English as the base language would easily transfer the English structure onto German, thereby causing the error:

Mein	Bruder	hat	gekocht	ugali
(Possesive pronoun)	*(Noun)*	*(Auxiliary)*	*(Past participle)*	*(direct object)*
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
My	brother	has	made/cooked	ugali

6.7.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalinguistic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	1 (3%)	- Blank space
Level 1	3 (7%)	- KG4: *Wrong tenses have been used (Past tense to mean the present),* - SB3: *Verbs should be used at the end of the sentence* - SB4: *The conjugated verb should come at the end*
Level 2	2 (5%)	- MB2: *Arrangement of the sentence* - MB4: *Wrong arrangement*

[100] Dreyer & Schmitt give a comprehensive explanation of when to use which auxiliary (Dreyer & Schmitt, 2008, pp. 63–64).

Level 3	5 (13%)	- KG3: *Wrong verb position* - SB11: *The verb should be at the end of the sentence* - MB6: *The verb "gekocht"* - KG6: *Wrong verb positioning*
Level 4	4 (10%)	- KG11: *"Gekocht" has been placed wrongly* - SB2: *The "gekocht" should come at the end of the sentence* - MB1: *The position of the word "gekocht"* - MB7: *The word "gekocht" should be at the end.*
Level 5	24 (61%)	- KG1: P*osition of then verb in Perfekt* - KG2: *Wrong verb position (gekocht)* - SB1: *The verb "gekocht" should come at the end of the sentence* - SB5: *The verb in Perfekt should be at the end* - PG3: *The participle "gekocht" should be in the last position* - PG7: *The verb in perfekt is in the wrong position* - SB8: *The partizip verb should be at the end* - MB5: *Word order "gekocht"* - KG9: *Verb position "gekocht"*

Table 10: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Mein Bruder hat gekocht ugali"

This item tested the learners' awareness of grammatical constructions of the perfect tense in German, especially with regard to the positioning of the past participle. 65% of the learners exhibited well-developed metalinguistic knowledge in this regard by pointing out that the error lies in the wrong position of the verb "gekocht". Many of them also used appropriate grammatical terminology e.g. verb in perfekt, the participle, the partizip verb etc. (The use of the German spelling discussed in detail in 6.12.2.).

Given that key to the principle of retraceability potential lies in precision, items that got a Level 3 rating (13%) raise more questions than answers; KG3: *Wrong verb position,* KG6: *Wrong verb positioning* - Which of the two verbs? SB11: *The verb should be at the end of the sentence*- which one? MB6: *The verb "gekocht"*- What about it? They however are all able to correct the error.

There were only 2 instances of inability to correct the error, one from SB6 who offered no explanation of the error, and the other from KG4, whose explanation

Wrong tenses have been used (Past tense to mean the present) is reflected in the attempted correction *Mein Bruder kocht Ugali*.

The question of whether explicit knowledge gets lost still persists, with the presence of only 2 failed correction attempts while explanations given by 11 learners exhibit underdeveloped (Level 0-3%, Level 1-7%) and relatively well developed (Level 2- 5%, Level 3-13%) metalinguistic knowledge.

6.7.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

As with the other items, the learners largely focused on the direct translation as the source of the error. 30 learners attributed the error the to the direct translation of the English phrase "My brother has cooked ugali", 2 learners to the direct translation of the Kiswahili phrase "Ndugu/Kaka yangu amepika ugali" while 7 think it could be from both English and Kiswahili. All these point to the learners' awareness of the errors that could arise if the literal translation from Kiswahili and English into German is unchecked.

In their tracing of the cross-linguistic influence, the learners' explanations hint at bi-directional transfer, with German influencing English (Herdina & Jessner, 2002, p. 66; Pavlenko & Scott, 2002). The learners give the perfect tense in English (My brother has cooked ugali) as the directly translated sentence, instead of the simple past (My brother cooked ugali). As discussed in 6.7.1., the simple past is more commonly used in English when referring to events in the past, unlike in German, where the perfect tense is more prevalent. Even though the sentence lacked contextual embedding to determine if the action of making ugali was completely closed or not, the tendency is to equate the German perfect tense to the English simple past tense. It has been noted that "like the English past tense, this German tense [the perfect tense] does <u>not</u> convey the idea of an incomplete or continuous action, but simply indicates that the action or event took place at some time in the past" (Durrell & Hammer, 2002, p. 292).

6.8. Item 8: Ich habe eine Katze. Es heißt Mai.

6.8.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

The phrase "Ich habe eine Katze. Es heißt Mai" contravenes the grammatical rules of standard German language. The error arises as a result of using the neuter personal pronoun "es", which is incongruent with the feminine noun "eine Katze". Agoya-Wotsuna (2012, p. 219) discusses the difficulties Kenyan learners of German have mastering the gender system of noun classification in German, and the subsequent declensions of articles, pronouns, adjectives etc. She pegs this on the different noun classification systems in the three Kenyan languages her comparative study was based on, amongst them, Kiswahili which uses the subject prefixes as the concordial markers to categorize nouns into eighteen classes; **a-wa; u-i; li-ya; ki-vi; u-zi; u-ya; ku-; pa-ku-mu**[101] (Mohamed, 2001, p. 48). Kiswahili therefore does not know the masculine-feminine-neuter classification system; all living/animate beings are classified in the **a-wa** class regardless of their sex. These subject prefixes – as bound morphemes- also act as pronoun prefixes in the third person singular and plural, hence:

Huyu ni msichana. **A**nasoma kitabu.	This is a girl. **She** is reading a book.
Huyu ni ng'ombe. **A**nakula nyasi.	This is a cow. **It** is eating grass.
Huyu ni mzee. **A**napika.	This is an old man. **He** is cooking.
Nina paka. **A**naitwa Mai.	I have a cat. **It** is called Mai.

As demonstrated, and in line with Agoya-Wotsuna's position, the pronoun prefix in Kiswahili is not sex/gender specific, unlike English, where the use of personal pronouns she/he distinguishes between males and females, while animals take the pronoun "it".[102] With this background, it is clear why Kenyan learners of German would have trouble with the proper usage of the personal pronoun "es", leading to errors similar to that presented by the given phrase.

[101] Modern grammars analyse nouns in Kiswahili on the basis of their "function" rather than "form", by basing their classification on the grammatical markers. The singular and plural as are marked as separate classes, hence the total of 14. **ku-** signals verbal nouns or gerunds, while **pa-ku-mu-** indicate location, with **pa-**implying "definiteness", **ku-** "indefiniteness", and **mu-** "withinness", bringing the total to 18 (Mohamed, 2001, p. 51)

[102] There are some preferences to use the pronouns "she/he" for pets, because these have closer and personal relationships with their owners.

In this instance, the typology of English is more similar to that of German. For many Kenyan learners of German, there is the tendency to use the personal pronoun "es" as the default pronoun for animals, as is the case of English's "it". It is therefore conceivable that the subjects gravitate towards influence from English as the cause of the error.

6.8.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalingustic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	4 (10%)	- KG9: Blank space - KG13: *Using "heißt"* - SB11: *Feminine words should start with "sie"* - MB4: *Use of "eine" which is irrelevant*
Level 1	4 (10%)	- MB7: *The verb "eine" should not be there* - PG4: *Article in the second sentence* - KG8: *Direct translation*
Level 2	5 (13%)	- KG12: *Wrong Artikel "es"* - PG6: *The gender of the cat is supposed to be "sie" because it says "eine"* - PG5: *Katze is a noun and female. Use the proper article "sie"* - MB2: *Preposition "es"* - SB9: *Feminine nouns use the articles "sie"*
Level 3	8 (21%)	- KG10: *Wrong use of the pronoun "es"* - PG1: *"Es" is used wrongly* - PG2: *Eine Katze: feminine noun* - KG3: *Wrong use of pronoun*
Level 4	5 (13%)	- KG4: *Katze is female, so it should be "sie"* - KG6: *Use of "es" for a female cat yet it should be "sie"* - KG7: *Using "es" instead of "sie"* - MB6: *"es"*
Level 5	13 (33%)	- SB3: *Wrong pronoun used* - SB5: *The pronoun is not appropriate* - PG7: *The pronoun 'es' is supposed to be 'sie' because 'Katze' is feminine"* - KG5: *Article for Katze is "die" so it is wrong to say "es"*

Table 11: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Ich habe eine Katze. Es heißt Mai"

This item tested the learners' knowledge of the personal pronouns in German, and how they differ from those in English. As already pointed out, the error in

this item lies in the use of the personal pronoun "es" in reference to "Katze", which takes the feminine gender. Explanations from 18 learners exhibited sufficient knowledge of the phenomenon, hence the high rating (15% Level 4, 33% Level 5).

A number of the explanations that received a Level 3 rating read *wrong use of pronoun* or *wrong use of pronoun "es"*. This seems to suggest that the pronoun in itself and in the context of this construction is correct and that the problem lies in the way it is used in the sentence. Going by the principle of retraceability, these explanations can only be partly acceptable, especially when compared to the explanation *wrong pronoun used*, which makes it clear that the pronoun is in itself unacceptable. It also raises the issue of the learners' proficiency in the English language that also serves as their main base language in their learning of German as a foreign language.[103]

Only 4 learners were unable to correct the error. Looking at their explanations, the deficiency in grammatical (hence metalinguistic) knowledge is evident:

Learner/Level	**error explanation**	**attempt at error correction**
KG13 (L0)	Using "heißt"	Es ist Mai
MB2 (L1)	Preposition "es"	Er heißt mai
MB4 (L0)	Use of "eine" which is irrelevant	Ich habe katze
MB7 (L1)	The verb "eine" shouldn't be there because it is irrelevant	Ich habe Kate. Es heiße Mai

KG13 fails to identify the pronoun as the offending entity, focusing instead on the verb "heißt", whose use is perfectly in order here. MB4 refers to "es" as a preposition, then goes ahead and replaces it with "er" (which is also a pronoun), thereby exhibiting insufficient knowledge of grammatical categories. MB7 also classifies "eine" an indefinite article as a verb. MB4's explanations manifests underdeveloped syntactical knowledge, since one of the combinatorial requirement of the German language is that nouns are accompanied by their

[103] Although all the learners rated themselves as being either "very good" or "good" in English. (Chapter 1.4.3.).

corresponding articles. Grammatical terminology seems to be quite problematic, as other learners made reference to *the article "es"* (instead of pronoun).

6.8.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

The majority (36/39) of the learners traced the error to influence from English, with only three tracing it back to Kiswahili. "(Direct) translation" continues to be listed as the leading cause of the error, with many of the subjects giving the sentence "It is called Mai" as the equivalent sentence in English. This points to an awareness of cross-linguistic influence, manifested as infractions on the rules of the German language, if its gender classifications of nouns are not adhered to in the consideration of the pronoun. The learners' understanding of "translation" however, is still quite puzzling.

There is some evidence of the reflection of the grammatical phenomena governing the rules of the English language, and by extension how these rules relate to those of the German language. These include; SB5 *All things apart from human beings take the pronoun it*, SB8 *In English, "it" is used to replace animals as well as objects* and MB6 *Pronoun traced back to English-cat will be "it".*

6.9. Item 9: Ich möchte Arzt bekommen

6.9.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

The phenomenon of "false friends" arising from cross-linguistic interaction between German and English has been addressed by a number of authors, most notably (Hufeisen, 1994). In her book *English im Unterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, "false friends" are defined as words that look and sound alike (in English and German), but whose meanings are different. She presents a list of these false friends, in which the verb presented to the subjects in this study, (bekommen) is included.

As discussed, Kenyan learners of German are also susceptible to making errors caused by false friends. In both studies of Agoya-Wotsun (2012) and Hinga (2015), errors involving the verb "bekommen" are identified, with Hinga observing that the highest number of errors involving false friends had to do

with the verb "bekommen". Given its prevalence, this study sought to investigate the learners' awareness of this phenomenon.

The phrase "ich möchte Arzt bekommen" is modelled on the error depicted in Agoya-Wotsuna's study "[I]ch möchte Ingenieur bekommen (2012, p. 273). Due to the orthographic and phonologic similarities of the English verb "to become" and the German verb "bekommen", learners of German who have learnt English before tend to mix the two up.

6.9.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalingustic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	Examples
Level 0	4 (4%)	- Blank space (SB9, SB11) - KG11: *"Möchte" has been wrongly used* - PG7: *Misuse of the German word*
Level 1	3 (8%)	- KG8: *Direct translation* - KG9: *Wrong use of modal verbs (möchte)* - KG12: *Wrong usage of the verb "möchte"*
Level 2	1 (3%)	- KG3: *Wrong choice of words*
Level 3	3(8%)	- SB8: *Wrong verb is used* - MB4: *Wrong verb* - PG6: *Use of the wrong verb*
Level 4	21 (53%)	- KG6: *"Bekommen"* - KG1: *Wrong use of the word 'bekommen' –to receive"* - SB4: *Wrong use of "bekommen"* - KG10: *Wrong word usage (bekommen)"* - PG3: *The word "bekommen" is used to mean "become" in English.* - MB3: *The verb "bekommen"* - PG8: *"Bekommen" means "to get", not "to become"* - PG4: *The last word should be different and appropriate to German* - KG13: *Using "bekommen" instead of "werden"*
Level 5	7(18%)	- KG4: *Wrong choice of the verb "bekommen"* - MB1: *Using the verb "bekommen"* - PG5: *"Bekommen" is the wrong verb. We use "werden"* - MB2: *The verb "bekommen"*

Table 12: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Ich möchte Arzt bekommen"

This item tested the learners' awareness of the verb "bekommen" as a false friend. Explanations from 28 learners exhibited high awareness of this error (21% received a Level 4 rating, 18% received a Level 5 rating). Since the error results from the use of "bekommen" to mean "werden", only the mention of "bekommen" suffices, because it is clear that it is the erroneous entity in this case. This is supported by the fact that apart from one learner, all the others who cited the singled out "bekommen" as the cause of the error were able to rewrite the sentence correctly. MB5 is the only one whose explanation and the resulting attempt at correction exhibit synthesis fail: He gives *The verb "bekommen"* as the explanation for the error, (which received a level 5 rating as it clearly points out what the offending entity is). In correcting the error, however, it becomes evident that he is not aware of the false friends phenomenon in this case, as he writes *Ich möchte Arzt kommen,* which is not only ungrammatical, but also lacks semantic coherence.

The other failed attempts at correcting the error correspond to the explanations given by the learners:

Learner/Level	**error explanation**	**attempt at error correction**
KG8 (L1)	Direct translation	Ich wird Arzt bekommen
KG9 (L1)	Wrong use of the modal verb (möchte)	Ich werde Arzt bekommen
KG11 (L0)	Möchte has been used wrongly	Ich möchte ein Arzt bekommen
KG12 (L1)	Wrong use of the verb "möchte"	Ich werde Arzt bekommen

It is interesting that all the learners who exhibit the lowest level of awareness are all from the same school. Given that these are four out of thirteen participants from this school, it raises the question if this faulty metalinguistic knowledge is as a result of input. This would not be inconceivable, seeing that the role of the teacher in the acquisition and development of grammatical knowledge has been singled out as important (See 4.3.1.)

6.9.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

As discussed, this item aimed at testing the learners' awareness of the error brought about by false cognates *become/bekommen*, especially in the light of the studies that showed that Kenyan learners of German are prone to these errors. All the subjects traced the error back to English, as was expected. They were able to make the connection to the sentence expressing future professional aspirations, and gave translations of the phrases "I would like to become a doctor"/ "I want to become a doctor" as the cause of the error.

Quite a number of subjects are more definitive in their explanations, exhibiting a high awareness of the cross-linguistic interaction that lead to the error: KG2 and KG10's *"bekommen" resembles "become"*, SB10's *"bekommen" has been mistaken to mean "become"*, and PG2's "*bekommen" sounds like the English verb "become"* point to an awareness of the confusion that could arise from the orthographic and phonological similarity of these verbs.

16 learners attribute the error to the direct translation from English to German. While directed translation was understood as literal one-to-one translation from either English or Kiswahili to German leading to morpho-syntactic errors, the use of the same in the case of lexical-semantic errors leads to the question of what "direct translation" mean to these learners.

The question then remains, why this error remains prevalent, even with the subjects exhibiting its awareness. PG5's *Assumption: 'bekommen' and 'become' look similar* offers insight to what happens to a lot of learners that are learning German after English. Due to the typological similarities of German and English, with both being Germanic languages, there exists a lot of true cognates which are helpful to the learners as they are able to figure out their meanings from their English equivalences. When the learners encounter these internationalisms, they might then get blind to the fact that there also exist false friends, and "assume" (make the conclusion, hence the erroneous generalization) that all words with orthographic and phonetic similarities carry the same meanings in both languages. Hufeisen (1994) calls for the explicit drawing of attention to these

words, so as to sensitize the learners and avoid confusion. This will help develop the multilingual language learning awareness.

6.10. Item 10: Es möchte regnen

6.10.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

For a non-Kenyan, the phrase "es möchte regnen" might be difficult to comprehend due to the use of the modal verb "möchten", whose meaning gets lost in the context of the given phrase.

According to Duden the modal verb "mögen/möchten (Habermann, Diewald, & Thurmair, 2012)[104]" has two main functions:

- Expression of conjecture
- Expression of preference and or inclination.

In the given phrase, the verb cannot be said to express either. As such, its use (in this phrase) is detrimental to the communicativeness of the construction.

For a Kenyan speaker of German, however, it will be easy to connect the dots and understand the intended meaning of the phrase. This sentence can be traced back to the "Kenyan English" construction of "it wants to rain", which, compared to standard English, is an ungrammatical reproduction of "it is going to rain". This construction in the so-called "Kenyan English" can in turn be traced back to the Kiswahili "inataka kunyesha", and the syntactical overlap is evident:

i-	na-	-taka	kunyesha
(subject prefix)[105]	*tense marker*[106]	*verb stem "to want"*[107]	*Infinitive "to rain"*
it	wants		to rain

[104] "Möchten" is actually the subjunctive form of the modal verb "mögen".
[105] Also referred to as "empty/dummy subjects" (Mohamed, 2001, p. 59).
[106] **Na-** generally accepted by Swahili grammarians as a present tense marker, so long as noting in the context indicates the past or the future. (Ashton, 1977, p. 37; Mohamed, 2001, p. 122).
[107] "ku-taka" means "to want"/"need", and its use with the tense marker **na-** denotes the future. Ashton adds that "kutaka" also means "to be about to", and corresponds to the notion of "Immediate Future tense (Ashton, 1977, p. 36; p.277).

Previous studies on multilingualism and German as a foreign language in Kenya,[108] as well as findings from the self-evaluation of the participants of the present study (chapter 4) have established that Kenyan learners of German tend to use English as the fall back or what Hufeisen and Marx refer to as helper/bridge languages when learning German as a foreign language (in Thije & Zeevaert, 2007, pp. 303–321). It is therefore plausible that the error exhibited in this item stems from a fossilized error in the English language, which is then transferred onto German.

6.10.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalingustic rating scale

Scale	Learners n=39	- Examples
Level 0	3 (8%)	- PG4: Blank space - PG2: *The sentence does not make sense* - PG3: *The sentence is grammatically wrong*
Level 1	11 (28%)	- KG1: *Direct translation* - MB7: *Direct translation from English* - SB6: *Direct translation, two verbs* - SB11: *The conjugation of the word "möchte'"* - PG5: *Modal verbs cannot be used by non-living things/animals* - PG1: *The verb has been conjugated wrongly*
Level 2	2 (5%)	- KG2, KG3: *Wrong choice of words*
Level 3	9 (23%)	- KG5: *Direct translation from Kiswahili to German* - KG4: *Wrong choice of verb* - KG11: *"Möchte" has been used wrongly* - SB1: *The sentence has used the verb "möchte" inappropriately* - SB9: *Wrong use of "möchte"*
Level 4	6 (15%)	- KG6: *Das Wort "möchte" instead of "wird"* - KG13: *Using "möchte" instead of "weird"* - MB3: *Möchte* - SB5: *Use of "möchte"*
Level 5	7 (18%	- MB2: *Wrong verb "möchten"* - SB8: *"Möchte" is the wrong helping verb to be used"* - MB1: *Use of the modal verb "möchte"*

Table 13: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Es möchte regnen"

[108] Most notably (Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012; Hinga, 2015).

This item tested the learners' ability to determine that the modal verb "möchten" is the wrong choice in this context. 14 learners gave explanations that were gauged as fully acceptable. Like in other items containing lexical-semantic deviations, mentioning the erroneous entity alone (*e.g Möchten, the verb "möchten", the word "möchten"*) is regarded as sufficient evidence for knowledge of the error, hence the well-developed categorization.

However, There are instances where there is a discrepancy between the leaners' explanations (which are rated as fully acceptable) and their attempts at correcting the errors in the case of MB1, MB2, MB3, MB5:

Learner/Level	**error explanation**	**attempt at error correction**
MB1 (L5)	Use of the modal verb "möchte"	Es darf regnen
MB2 (L5)	Wrong verb (möchte)	Es darf regnen
MB5 (L5)	The verb "möchte"	Es darf regnen
MB3 (L4)	Möchte	Es regnet.

In the case of MB1, MB2 and MB5, it is evident that they lack sufficient semantic knowledge of the modal verbs, or else they would not come up with the *es darf regnen* construction, which more or less means "it is allowed to rain". The same could be said of MB4, who does away with the modal verb altogether. This conclusion is reinforced by their explanation that the error stems from the translation of the Kiswahili phrase *kunataka kunyesha*, which (directly) translates to "it is going to rain".

Other cases of unsuccessful attempts at corrections reveal underdeveloped semantic and grammatical knowledge, not only in German but also in English and Kiswahili, and also gaps in the learners' connection of these languages:

Learner/Level	**error explanation**	**attempt at error correction**
MB7 (L1)	Direct translation from English	Es Regen geben
PG1 (L1)	The verb has been conjugated wrongly	Es möchte zu regnet
PG2 (L0)	The sentence does not make sense	Es wollte gerade regnen
PG3 (L3)	The sentence is grammatically wrong	Es ist regnen
PG5 (L1)	Modal verbs cannot be used by non-living things/animals	Es ist ungefähr regnen

PG6 (L1)	Modal verbs should be used with non-living things	Es ist regnen
PG7 (L1)	Modal verb not properly conjugated	Es regnet sehr viel
PG8 (L1)	Only people and animals are used with modal verbs	Es ist ungefähr regnen

The learners' attempts at corrections contain errors, some of which have been the subject of this study, e.g. PG3's and PG6's addition of the auxiliary "ist" in the present tense (Es ist regnen). With the sentence *Es möchte zu regnen*, PG1 shows a deficiency in the knowledge of grammatical constructions using modal verbs, since "the modal verbs are followed by a 'bare' infinitive without zu" (Durrell & Hammer, 2002, p. 349). The addition of "zu" here can be traced to the English structure".

While PG7's correction is grammatically acceptable, it is in no way related to her description of the error, since she does away with the modal verb altogether, raising the question whether she knows what a modal verb is, and further reinforcing the importance of the mastery of grammatical categories as a metalinguistic aspect. It is also totally incompatible with the English sentence she gave as the source of the error: *It likes raining*. The same goes for the other learners whose attempts at correcting the error were unsuccessful; They all give the sentences that denote a future occurrence (*Inataka/Kunataka kunyesha, It wants to rain*) as the source of the error, but do not factor this in in their constructions, showing a gap in the grammatical inter-language connections.

Another observation is that of the explanations given by PG5, PG6, and PG7, with regard to the situational use of modal verbs, which points to some form of explicit explanation. The question if whether this has got to do with teacher input, especially given their elevated role discussed in 4.3.1.

6.10.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

As mentioned, this item sought to test the learners' awareness of an error in German that stems from an error that is prevalent in the Kenyan English, which can be traced back to Kiswahili (multileveled cross-linguistic influence). As such,

it was expected that the learners would either trace this error to Kiswahili, and if they traced it back to English, then they would also explain that the construction in (Kenyan) English from which this transfer stems is erroneous, in what would the application of metalinguistic knowledge as control of linguistic processing

19 (49%) learners trace the error back to English, with most of them (14) giving the translation of the phrase "it wants to rain" as the cause of the error. This, as explained, is an example of fossilized errors that have become a part of the Kenyan English, upon which learners of German unknowingly build. That the learners reproduce this erroneous English construction in their explanation makes it evident that they lack the knowledge and awareness needed to identify erroneous structures in English. It is then conceivable that they will make errors in German whose source is errors cemented in their bridge/helper language English. Only one learner (SB3) gives the correct English construction *it is going to rain*.

While a majority of the learners trace the error back to Kiswahili, many of them give the informal *kunataka kunyesha* as the source of the error, instead of the standard "inataka kunyesha".[109] Like in 6.6. above, it is surprising to see learners reproduce this colloquial construction in formal written exercise, like the given test. It shows a casual use of language, which leads to the blurring of the formal and informal language use. This aspect will be further addressed in the discussion below (6.12.4).

The learners' handling of this item exhibits a lack of awareness of ungrammaticality that might be embedded in English and Kiswahili, either as a result of cross-linguistic influence (in the case of "it wants to rain") or the prevalence of informal language use (in the case of "kunataka kunyesha").

6.11. Item 11: Ich habe Deutsch seit 3 Jahren gelesen

6.11.1. Linguistic explanation of the error

[109] Only 3 learners (KG2, MB2, and PG2) give a grammatically correct sentence in Standard Kiswahili.

The phrase "ich habe Deutsch seit 3 Jahren gelesen" contravenes a number of grammatical rules in Standard German language:

- Constructions using the temporal preposition/conjunction "seit" should be in the present tense,[110]
- When there are multiple adverbial phrases in a sentence, the temporal phrase takes precedence (following the Te-Ka-Mo-Lo order),[111]
- The choice of the verb "lesen" instead of "lernen".

While the contravened grammatical rules touching on the morphosyntax do not adversely affect the meaning – hence comprehension - of the sentence, the choice of then verb "lesen" (in its participle form "gelesen") does, hence the decision to focus on the learners' ability to discern the lernen - lesen confusion in the analysis.

Use of the verb "lesen" seems to be influenced by the verb "kusoma" in Kiswahili, and whose English equivalences are both "to read" and "to learn" in English, as shown in the Kiswahili- English Dictionary: **som.a** *kt* [*ele*] 1 read. 2 study, receive teaching; attend school; be educated. 3 observe sb. (…) (Chuo Kikuu cha Dar es Salaam, 2001). The possible cause of the error lies in the inability to make a distinction between the differentiated equivalences of the verb "kusoma" in English and also in German. What is not clear is whether this is from the fossilized form in the English language or the direct transfer from Kiswahili. Whatever the case, it's existence is evidence of cross-linguistic influence, and this item tests the leaners' awareness of the same.

6.11.2. Classification of the learners' explanations using the metalinguistic rating scale

As explained, the focus is on the lexical-semantic error caused by the use of the verb "lesen" in place of "lernen". Unfortunately, a majority of the study participants overlooked this error; only 15 learners caught it, going by the corrections that replaced "gelesen" with "gelernt". Consequently, only the

[110] See (Dreyer & Schmitt, 2008, p. 63; Hufeisen, 1994, p. 37)
[111] The order of multiple adverbial phrases in Standard German Temporal-> Kausal-> Modal-> Lokal.

explanations from these 15 learners are subjected to the metalinguistic rating scale.

Scale	Learners n=15	- Examples
Level 0	1 (7%)	- MB2: *Wrong word arrangement*
Level 1	3 (20%)	- KG9: *Wrong conjugation: gelesen-gelernen* - PG5: *The sentence structure is wrong* - PG2: *Wrong sentence structure*
Level 2	----	-
Level 3	5 (33%)	- KG1: *Direct translation –gelesen-nimesoma* - KG12: *Direct translation: gelesen-kusoma* - KG10, KG2: *Wrong choice of words (verb)* - MB1: *The form of the verb "gelesen"*
Level 4	2 (13%)	- KG4, KG6: *Use of "gelesen"*
Level 5	4 (27%)	- KG11: *"Gelesen" is the wrong verb that has been used in this sentence"* - PG8: *Sentence structure and the use of the word "gelesen"* - PG7: *Use of the wrong verb for the intended meaning, and the position of "Deutsch"* - MB5: *The verb "gelesen"*

Table 14: Rating of the learners' explanations of the error in "Ich habe Deutsch seit 3 Jahren gelesen"

The selection of the rated explanations, as already clarified, was determined by the presence of the verb "lernen" or its inflected varieties in the learners' corrections. This was taken as an indication that the learner had identified the verb "(ge)lesen" as the erroneous entity, hence the replacement. The rating is still based on acceptability determined by the principles of retraceability potential and grammatical terminology.

The discrepancy between some learners' explanations and their corrections evidence the insufficient grammatical knowledge; MB2 gives Wrong word arrangement as the explanation of the error, but in correcting it, he simply replaces "gelesen" with "gelernt" (*Ich habe deutsch seit 3 Jahren gelernt*). This means that the learner does not know that "word arrangement" is more about structure, and not the words used. Another example is in KG9's explanation of *wrong conjugation: gelesen-gelernen,* which indicates that the learner lacks the knowledge of what conjugation is and how it is used.

With KG1's and KG12's assertions that the error is caused by the direct translation of the verb "kusoma" to "lesen", the notion of "direct translation" among Kenyan learners of German takes another dimension; that of the direct equivalence of the words/terms in both languages, in terms of their most immediate and common usage. Looking at the Langenscheidts Kiswahili-German dictionary, the first entry given for the verb "kusoma" is "lesen" (Höftmann & Herms, 2000, p. 309). Although the dictionary continues to give other words like *vorlesen, verlesen, and rezitieren,* it is possible that the learners do not look beyond the first word "lesen", and so this sums up their conceptualisation of what "kusoma" is in German. For these learners, therefore, the automatic and only equivalent for "lesen" is "kusoma", hence direct translation.

6.11.3. Making the cross-linguistic connection

As mentioned, the error in this item lies in the use of the verb "lesen", which has been explained as resulting from the inability to pick the correct equivalence from the different meanings carried by the Kiswahili word "kusoma". 11 learners are able to make this connection. Of these, 7 rewrite the sentence using the correct verb "gelernt".

The fact that a majority of the learners did not find anything wrong with the use of the word "gelesen" in this sentence is evidence of a one-dimension view of the Kiswahili verb "kusoma", without consideration of the fact that it covers a wider scope in the German language. Agoya-Wotsuna discusses a similar one-dimensional transfer of the learners' mental lexicon in the case of the their use of the verb "to mean". She observes that the learners unilaterally equate it to the German verb "bedeuten", without factoring in the wide symbol-field it covers. This leads to the erroneous translation of the "I mean" to "ich bedeute" when clarifying a point, instead of the more appropriate "Ich meine" or "also"(Agoya-Wotsuna, 2012, pp. 272–273).

Quite a number of learners (SB4, SB5, SB6, MB6, MB7) trace the error to the translation of the English sentence "I have learnt German for 3 years". In correcting the error, however, they all replaced "learnt" with the "gelesen", despite the fact that the English verb "to learn" is equivalent to "lernen" in

German. This points to an inability to pick on the nuances in different words that have related meanings, which would guide them in selecting the correct equivalence from their rich pool of linguistic resources. Developed language awareness would sensitize the learners to such subtle nuances, which would in turn improve their communicative competence.

6.12. Discussion: What constitutes metalinguistic knowledge and awareness of cross-linguistic influence?

Drawing from the findings discussed above, this section discusses features of metalinguistic knowledge observed from the learners' handling of the UGJT, as well as their ability to use this knowledge in the negotiation of grammatical errors in the German language resulting from the influence of English and Kiswahili. In this section, the most salient findings are summed up and their significance for the study are discussed to establish the various aspects of metalinguistic knowledge as/and awareness of cross-linguistic influence.

6.12.1. Dimensions of "direct translation" as a multilingual learning skill

As has been observed across all the items, "direct translation" has been listed as one of the most common explanation of the errors, leading to the question of what the learners really mean by this. Looking at its prominence across all items, it is evident that it has different meanings for Kenyan learners of German, including:

i. Direct translation as one-to-one translation, literal translation: Words from one language are directly substituted with their equivalences in another language without consideration of structural differences in the languages. In this case, learners replace English/Kiswahili words with their German equivalences without regard of the syntactic differences of these languages. This is evident in the learners' explanations of the morphosyntactic errors.

ii. Direct translation as the use of a similar sounding or appearing word in the target language, without regard to the agreement in meaning.

This is seen in the learners' explanations of the lexical-semantic error "ich möchte Arzt bekommen", which stems from the phenomenon of false friends. For the learners, since "bekommen" sounds and looks like "become", then they (the learners) give the cause of the error as "direct translation".

iii. Direct translation as the uptake of one of the multiple equivalences of the word in the target language as the only true match. This might be as a result of restricting oneself to the first dictionary entry, forgetting that some words have extended semantic field or are polysemous (e.g. in the case of kusoma -> lernen/lesen in the item "ich habe Deutsch seit 3 Jahren gelesen" (6.11)) Agoya-Wotsuna (2012) identified quite a number of errors in the German of Kenyan learners, which are attributed to this practice (pp. 272-278).[112]

While (i) is in line with the common understanding of direct translations, (ii) and (iii) point to insufficient knowledge of the use of dictionaries. The participants of this study stated that they use dictionaries as part of their German language learning strategies. This, however, this does not necessarily mean that they know how to use them. Agoya-Wotsuna already called for the teaching of dictionary use among Kenyan learners of German (2012, p. 251). However, as Schneider posits, language teachers are not equipped to impart skills of dictionary use amongst learners (1993 p.98 cit. in Agoya-wotsuna, 2012, p. 250), calling for an investigation into whether this has changed, and if and/or what kind of intervention is required.

6.12.2. Knowledge of Grammatical categories and terminology as awareness

As discussed, grammatical terminology is an important aspect of metalinguistic knowledge, whose relevance is underscored by the discussion on the composition of the German lesson and course books (Chapter 1.4.2), and also the learners' feedback on the centrality of grammar in the learning of German as a foreign language (Chapter 4). It is for this reason that the learners' mastery of

[112] See 2.9.5.3.

grammatical terminology was also used to determine the acceptability of the learners' explanations of the errors. The analysis of the learners' metalinguistic comments point to the following:

1. Grammatical categories

a) Verbs

Many learners are able to identify verbs correctly. In many cases, learners make reference to e.g. *the verb sind, Position of the verb "spielen", choice of the wrong verb "bekommen"* etc. In specifying the role of the verb in the sentence, there were many instances of borrowing the German term "infinitive verb" (also with the spelling "infinitiv") for the non-finite verb.[113] This could mean two things; one, that the learners do not know the English equivalence of the term "infinitiv", hence the use of the German spelling, or two, that the learners do not know that there is a difference between the infinitive and the non-finite forms of a verb. Given that the verb in German remains unchanged in the two forms, then it is possible that they lack the knowledge in the English grammar.

With modal verbs, however, it is evident that fewer learners are able to identify them as such (only 5 learners in the item "es möchte regnen", 6 in the item "Er kann Fußball spielen", and 1 in the item "ich möchte Arzt bekommen"). Many simply refer to them as verbs.

The learners also generally exhibit mastery of the grammatical processes tied to verbs, e.g. conjugation, forming the participle to construct the perfect tense, etc.

[113] The infinitive is often introduced by "to", and is also called the "base form". The non-finite verb, however, is one that's not inflected, e.g. it the sentence "I can play football": "can" is finite because it is conjugated to be in agreement with the subject as well as reflect the present tense; "play" is non-finite since it doesn't change. The infinitive verb is "to play" (Nelson & Greenbaum, 2016, p. 93).

b) Pronouns

In their explanations of the error in the item 8 “ich habe eine Katze, es heißt Mai”, 18 learners are able to identify “es” as a pronoun. However, 4 learners refer to them as “articles” (KG12: *Wrong Artikel “es”* , SB9: *Pronouns use the article* “sie”PG5: *Katze is a noun and it is female. Use the article “es”,* PG4: *Article in the second sentence*), and PG6 states: *the gender of the cat is supposed to be “sie” because it says “eine”.* While these explanations point to the learners understanding of the gender system of the German language and how it affects the determiners, they also show the need for further clarification so that the leaners are able to differentiate between the various categories. The need for more targeted instruction is also seen in MB2’s reference to preposition in *Preposition “es”.*

c) Articles

While a majority of the learners correctly identify articles in the items “Ich bin Mädchen/ich bin Junge” and “Ich schlafe in Schule”, very few of them specify if they are definite or indefinite articles. There are however instances where a definite article is referred to as a verb (MB7: *The verb “eine” should not be there[…],* MB7: *“The verb “eine” is missing)*, also as a preposition (KG5: *The nouns lack prepositions […], No preposition to show it is singular*). Mastering the articles and their declension presents a challenge to many learners of German as a foreign language; including the participants of this study. While Eckhard-Black and Whittle propose that “the declensions of the indefinite and definite articles must be memorized” (1992, p. 11), the teachers must also find ways to make it easier for the learners to master them.

d) Interrogatives

Learners realize the interrogative pronoun in various ways: *W-Wort, W-Frage, W-Question, Question word, interrogative,* etc., all showing mastery of the terminology in both English and German. There are others like *question form* and *interrogative word*, which although unusual indicate that the learners understand the concept and are attempting to formulate it in their words. This is

in line with the position that metalinguistic knowledge is not about the memorization of grammatical elements and rules, but rather the ability to reflect upon and synthesize them, and consequently apply the knowledge in one's engagement with language.

e) Conjunctions

Only 2 learners refer to "weil" as a "subordinating conjunction", while 6 others make reference to the "subordinate clause". For the majority, it is simply "weil", despite the fact that even the course book introduces it as "Konjunktion (weil)" (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009b, p. 47). Failure to use the terminology could be read as a sign of unfamiliarity, hence the call for familiarizing measures.

6.12.3. Mastery of grammatical rules as a marker of language awareness

Multilingual grammatical awareness has been discussed as the learners' ability to sift through the grammars making up his/her multilingual system (Section 2.9). This is an important skill because it enables a learner to navigate an interwoven multilingual system and focus their attention to the separate language entities, as the language lesson requires. It manifests in the learner's ability to make demarcations within their multilingual system; to identify which grammar belongs to which language, point out how deviations in one grammar would be caused by the influence of another. In handling the UGJT, the Kenyan learners of German had to separate at the same time make connections of the grammars of English, Kiswahili, and German, thereby giving an insight into how their multilingual grammatical awareness is developed.

In the learners' engagement with the UGJT items, their knowledge of and about the grammar of the German language was evident, and was discussed under each item. Since the errors stem from cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German, the learners also had to draw from their knowledge of and about these languages to handle the test, giving us insights into how well they have mastered the grammatical rules of English and Kiswahili, leading to the following observations:

i. The learners show mastery of the construction of the present continuous tense in English (Item 1)
ii. The learners show mastery of the construction of questions using interrogative pronouns in Kiswahili (Item 2)
iii. The learners show mastery of constructions involving modal verbs in English (Item 3)
iv. The learners show mastery of the constructions involving the subordinating conjunction "because" in English and "kwa sababu" in Kiswahili (Item 4)
v. The learners show mastery of the use of articles in English and the lack of these in Kiswahili (Item 5&6)
vi. The learners show mastery of the construction of the past tense in English and Kiswahili (Item 7)
vii. The learners show mastery of the use of pronouns (item 8)

6.12.4. Language unawareness I: Arbitrary language use

Despite the fact that the UGJT is a test written in the classroom, there was still evidence of very casual language use, evidenced by:

i) Code mixing

- KG8: *Nimekuwa nikisoma German tangu nikiwa miaka tatu*
- SB7*: Nimesoma Deutsch miaka tatu*

ii) Informal and/or ungrammatical Kiswahili

- *Miaka tatu* instead of "miaka mitatu"
- *kunataka kunyesha* (Standard Kiswahili explained in 6.10.1.)
- SB2: *Anaeza cheza mpira:* An orthographic realization of the colloquial spoken form of "anaweza"
- KG1 & KG5: *Kwa sababu niko mgonjwa* instead of "kwa sababu mimi ni mgonjwa"

- MB1: *Niko na paka. Inaitwa Mai*: *Niko* is an informal realization of "ni na" (I have). The personal pronoun for cat is marked by the subject morpheme "A-" and not "I-" (detailed explanation in 6.8.1)
- KG1: *Nimesoma Jerumani miaka tatu*: "Jerumani" is the wrong Kiswahili term for "German". The correct one if "Kijerumani". The omission of the temporal preposition "kwa" before "miaka (mi)tatu" is a typical colloquial realization.
- KG2 & KG4: *Nimesoma Ujerumani kwa miaka mitatu*: Ujerumani is Germany
- *Tunalala shule*: Omission of the locative marker "-ni" is typical colloquial realization.

iii) Informal and/or ungrammatical English

- KG8: *We sleeping in school*: Omission of the auxiliary "are"
- MB7: *Am girl/boy*: Omission of the subject "I" as well as the indefinite articles "a"
- *It wants to rain* (See 6.10/ 6.12.3)
- *I have a cat. It's name is Mai:* Presence of the apostrophe

It is evident that Kiswahili is more prone to informality and deviation. This is in line with the learners' self-evaluation, in which they all rated their Kiswahili skills as weaker that their English skills. The prejudice against Kiswahili has been discussed in 1.4.3.

The use of informal language in the formal test setting also points to a shortfall in the development of the multilingual proficiency aspects of the separation of the basic communicative skills and the formal academic language use, similar to Cummins' model of Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)(Cummins, 2008). While colloquialism and code mixing is perfectly acceptable in the everyday functionality of meeting the language needs of these multilingual learners, its use

for academic purposes is neither appropriate nor desired (Wairungu, 2014).[114] Developed multilingual language learning awareness means knowing where and when to draw boundaries of informal language use.

6.12.5. Language unawareness II: multileveled cross-linguistic Influence

With the item "Es möchte regnen", the learners' ability to identify an error that is present in their English language and consequently transferred into their German language was tested. From the learners' explanation of the error source, it is evident that the learners do not find the construction "it wants to rain" erroneous in English, as none of those who give it as the source of the error point to its ungrammaticality. More evidence is seen in the fact that some of the learners give both English and Kiswahili as the source of the error, showing that the error has become so entrenched in the English language, that it is no longer identified as such.

In this item, an example of cross-linguistic transfer, described by Bouvy as "unconscious interacting phenomenon between evolving sets of imperfectly acquired structures" (2000, p. 143) is seen. While the systems are imperfect, the learners might perceive them as perfect;[115] like in the case of this study's participants, who did check the grammaticality of their given source sentence in English (it wants to rain), because they are convinced it is grammatically correct.

The German teacher must also check the learners' knowledge of the bridge languages (in this case English) to avoid such erroneous transfers. It is based on this that Muchira (2018, pp. 125–136) made practice-oriented suggestions of turning the Kenyan German lesson into a "languages lesson", arguing that by doing so, the learners would have a chance to explore and improve their (other) languages, which would in turn enhance their learning of the German language, and contribute to the development of language awareness among the learners.

[114] Although teachers, acknowledging that their learners' competence in English as the medium of instruction is not always fully developed to meet their needs result to translanguaging (using multiple languages) as a classroom strategy to bridge the language gap (Mwaniki, 2016).
[115] They rate their English skills as either "very good" or "good" in the self-evaluation (Section 1.3.3.).

6.12.6. Error correction with no and/or wrong explanation: Lost explicit knowledge?

A phenomenon that kept recurring is the learners' inability to explain the errors although they are bale to correct them, similar to the findings of Green & Hecht that led to the conclusion that learners' ability to correct the errors exceed the ability to explain them (Green & Hecht, 1992). This led to the question of whether the learners discussed amongst themselves to get the correct answer; which does not seem plausible, since they might as well have discussed the error explanation while at it. This apparent breakdown between what the learners should know and what they seem to know calls for the examination of the development and maintenance of metalinguistic and explicit knowledge.

As was postulated in chapters 1 & 2,[116] Kenyan secondary school pupils learn German through explicit instruction in the classroom, which consequently leads to the development of explicit knowledge (Ellis, 1994, p. 642; Hulstijn, 2005, p.132, 2007, p. 654; Norris & Ortega, 2000). This argument was further reinforced by the empirical evidence of the learners' elevation of grammatical knowledge in chapter 4 (specifically 4.4.). One of the main characteristics of explicit knowledge is its verbalizability, meaning that a person who possesses this knowledge can and should be able express it, in the sense of self-report (Han & Ellis, 1998, p. 12). This is why it is equated with declarative knowledge (Alderson et al., 1997, p. 308; Dörnyei, 2009, p. 147; Ellis, 2004, p. 236); knowledge that can be declared.

Although the learners are able to correct the sentences, their inability to explain the ungrammaticality of the presented sentences shows a lack of explicit knowledge and underdeveloped metalinguistic skills. The question, then, is what happened to this knowledge, going by the fact that it was explicitly taught in the classroom. This study constructs two possible explanations for this state of affairs:

[116] See sections 1.4.2., 2.3.5.,

6.12.6.1. The strong interface position: more evidence

The first one is tied to DeKeyser's Interface position on the relationship between explicit and implicit knowledge (DeKeyser, 1998), in which he posits that explicit knowledge becomes implicit knowledge following practice. This offers the most plausible progression amongst Kenyan learners of German, seeing that:

(i) Formal instruction in the classroom is the first contact with and largely offers the only input the learners get in German as a foreign language, and

(ii) The learners give teacher instruction and revision of class material as most helpful in their learning of German as foreign language.[117]

DeKeyser in his introduction of the Skill Acquisition Theory on which the Interface position is built suggests explicit knowledge might be lost in the process of developing into implicit knowledge. He states that "Learners in this final stage of skill acquisition might lose the declarative knowledge of the rule" (DeKeyser, 1998, p. 49). The progression of knowledge development has been matched with the three stages of skill acquisition: The declarative knowledge with the cognitive stage, the proceduralization with the associative stage, and the automatizing/fine-tuning of the procedural knowledge with the autonomous stage (Fitts and Posner, 1967 Anderson 1982, p. 369, 1995, p. 319-340 cit. in DeKeyser, 1998, p. 48).

While the learners are technically still beginners in the learning of German as a foreign language, all the analysed items from the UGJT are drawn from content taught in their first and second years of learning German (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009a, 2009b). Seeing that the learners were completing their third year of study at the time of sitting the UGJT, and that they gave revision of taught and learned content as one of the strategies they use to learn German, it could mean that they have encountered and practiced these grammatical constructions over and over again to the point of complete routinization.

[117] Discussed in section 4.3.1.

Another point to consider is that the UGJT items present errors that are quite commonplace among the learners. While this study did not seek to establish this, it is highly likely that the teachers - based on practical experience - know of these "danger points" and draw attention to them, urging the learners to practice them so as to iron out the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili.[118] This repeated practice would consequently lead to the automatization of the structures.

6.12.6.2. Automatization by chunking

Another explanation also tied to repetition and practice is "chunking". Chunking is described as the " […]process of organizing or grouping input into familiar units or chunks (Miller, 1956, p. 94). In the field of language didactics, Nick Ellis defined it as "the development of permanent sets of associative connections in long-term storage and is the process that underlies the attainment of automaticity and fluency in language (1996, p. 107). There is general consensus that chunks are the first step towards enabling communication in a yet-to-be-learned language (Ellis, 1998, p. 647; Myles, Mitchell, & Hooper, 1999, p. 52). It is therefore only logical that they are introduced quite early in the language classroom through repetitive pattern drills, associative exercises and memorization of complex form (Myles, Hooper, & Mitchell, 1998, p. 326).

The main feature of chunks is that they are not derived from linguistic or grammatical rules, but are rather "rote learned or imitated chunks of unanalysed language that are available for learner use without being derived from generative rules" (Myles et al., 1999, p. 50). This seems to suggest that it is possible for learners to produce (complex) constructions, not because they have mastered the rules governing them, but because repeated exposure has led to entrenchment. An example of this would be in the teaching of the construction of the present tense in German. The teacher, conscious of the danger of cross-linguistic influence from English (Item 1), emphasizes the subject-verb-object syntactical order, while highlighting the subject-verb agreement marked by the

[118] "Don't think in English" heard a lot of German classes, as the teachers' way of cautioning the learners of the discrepancy of the grammatical rules between the two languages

verb conjugation. She/he then does several pattern-drill exercises with the learners, until she/he is convinced that the learners have mastered the construction, in that they can produce utterances that are in line with the given pattern.[119]

Has this learner learnt the rule of the construction of the present tense in German or simply mastered the patterns and made associations as a result of the repetitions?[120] It would seem more of the latter. This learner is able to construct more sentences by making associations and following the learnt pattern, but cannot explain the grammatical rules governing the construction of the present tense. The grammatical phenomena represented in the UGJT items can all be taught using pattern-drill like exercises. This could explain the learners' ability to correct the errors but not give their grammatical explanations.

6.13. Conclusion

The analysis and discussion of the learners' metalinguistic comments gave insight into how the learners handle errors in the German language resulting from the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili. From this, the various aspects and constructs of multilingual language learning awareness come to light, among them the learners' conception of direct translation, which is a prevalent feature of foreign language learning. Also evident is the learners' general mastery of grammatical rules and terminology across the three languages involved in the study. There is also evidence of "language unawareness", exhibited by instances of code-mixing as well as informal and ungrammatical use of English and Kiswahili in the written test, as well inability to identify errors arising from multileveled cross-linguistic influence. The discussion also advances the argument that the evident lose of explicit knowledge in German is tied to the notions of automatization and chunking.

[119] On the power of repetition, Nick Ellis states: "The more stimuli are repeated in STM [Short Term Memory], the greater the LTM [Long Term Memory], and in turn, the easier they are to repeat as sequences in STM" (Ellis, 1996, p. 107).
[120] Having in mind that the learners singled-out the rules of grammar associated with pattern-drills (4.2.1.)

7. SUMMARY, CONSEQUENCES, AND OUTLOOK

7.1. Summary of the study

This study conceptualised multilingual language learning awareness, defining it as the ability to negotiate the inevitable tension resulting from the interwovenness and interaction of the multiple languages making up the learners' multilinguality on one hand, and the distinct entity that is the target language (in this case standard German) on the other. Based on this concept, and with the aim of establishing the nature and status of the multilingual language learning awareness of Kenyan learners of German in secondary schools, the study investigated the learners' knowledge and perception of their multilinguality and how it plays out as cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German. In so doing, it went beyond the learners' self-evaluation of their awareness of their multilinguality, to investigate how they (the learners) apply their awareness in engaging with errors in the German language that arise from the influence of the interaction and interdependence of their languages. This allowed insight into what the learners really know, and not just what they think they know.

In its conceptualisation, the study acknowledged the impact of the sociolinguistic dynamics on learners' perception of their languages as well as their language learning behaviour, dynamics that shape their multilingual language awareness (section 1.4). This standpoint informed the explication of the Kenyan constructs and practices of multilingualism as the background for learning of German as a foreign language in Kenya, and the focus on the influence of English and Kiswahili on German to the exclusion of other languages present in the Kenyan sociolinguistic space. The findings affirm that:

- Learners' perception of their multilinguality is a reflection of the linguistic practices in Kenya. This is seen in the learners' hierarchical treatment of their languages, with English being at the very top, as well as the learners' insistence on having a higher proficiency of English in their self-evaluation;

- Kiswahili's agency in the learning of German as a foreign language is supressed and rejected, thereby denying any chance there might be of Kiswahili being used as a resource;
- while English's agency is constantly elevated as a reflection of its prestige in the society; it is the medium of instruction in schools, hence takes the role of mediator language in the German lesson. The German-English compilation of the teaching material as well as dictionaries fosters this position.

The study's conceptualisation of the empirical instruments threaded together the sociolinguistic realities of learning German as a foreign language in the Kenyan context, the theoretical foundations of language awareness, and the construct of multilinguality forwarded by the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism. The resulting open questionnaire delved into the question of what learners make of their multilinguality in their learning of German as a foreign language (Chapter 3), while the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test enabled access and assessment of the learners' knowledge about the grammatical structures languages, their interaction, and consequent influence of each other (Chapter 5).

The Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test took a metalinguistic dimension to the assessment of the learners' awareness of the cross-linguistic influence of English and Kiswahili on German. By so doing, the learners' responses to the items are regarded as outcome of their controlled and analytical engagement with German, English, and Kiswahili (metalinguistic knowledge). In the development of its analytical approach to its data, the constructs of retraceability potential and mastery of grammatical terminology are introduced, which are also used as measures of acceptability in the qualitative assessment of learners' metalinguistic comments. This enabled more differentiated treatment of the learner-knowledge spectrum and contributes to the discussion on the operationalization and validity of grammaticality judgement tests (Section 5.6).

The concept of language awareness, through the cognitive domain, advances the view of language as subject matter, thereby reinforcing the centrality of explicit grammatical knowledge in language learning. This, coupled with the holistic

approach to multilingualism advanced by the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism justified taking the learners' grammatical knowledge of the individual language systems, since the status of one affects the entire system (butterfly effect discussed in chapter 2). Consequently, this study investigated the learners' grammatical knowledge of English, Kiswahili, and German as markers of multilingual language learning awareness with the following outcome:

i. The learners exhibit a general mastery of grammatical categories and terminology. This is evident in the learners' application of linguistic/grammatical terminology in reference to the categories (seen in the tables summarizing the learners' explanations of the errors in chapter 6). There are however isolated instances of unacceptable references (section 6.12.2.). This aspect is crucial in the learning of German in Kenyan schools, since as discussed, the learners' mastery of this terminology at the beginning of learning German is regarded as axiomatic, seeing that they are used in the course books without further explanation.

ii. Their ability to explain the errors in German and make the cross-linguistic connections to English and Kiswahili shows a comprehension of the rules and structures governing the grammar of these three languages, as well as a reflection on their parallels and divergences. However, it is evident that the ability to make connections is limited to literal and one-to-one translations.

iii. The learners' inability to identify grammatical errors in the English language that are transferred to the German language thereby causing errors, is evidence of an underdeveloped awareness of cross-linguistic transfer, referred to in this study as multileveled cross-linguistic influence. This inability to identify the errors means that these errors are so entrenched in the English language and are no longer identified as such, echoing the postulation that Kenyan English differs from other Englishes of the world (section 2.9.5.2). The fact that Kenyan learners take this Kenyan English as the bridge/helper language in their learning of German as a foreign language (Chapter 4) justifies the

investigation of the Kenyan context in isolation from others classified as “German after English”.

iv. Focus on the linguistic/grammatical composition (form) of the learners’ metalinguistic comments in the analysis (chapter 6) revealed aspects of unawareness in the learners’ use of English and Kiswahili; seen in instances of colloquial language use in the formal written test e.g. code mixing and other informal and ungrammatical constructions in English and Kiswahili. While this phenomenon aligns to the discussion on Kenyan linguistic practices (5.3.1), multilingual language awareness includes the ability to identify the situational requirements and adjust the language (s) use accordingly, which the learners are not able to do.

Given the number of the study’s participants (n=39), these findings do not claim to be representative of all the learners of German as a foreign language in Kenyan secondary schools. It is therefore plausible that there are discrepancies in the nature of the multilingual language learning awareness among learners across the board. However, the choice of the participating schools offered a prototypical collection of learners in schools following the Kenyan curriculum. Moreover, the qualitative approach explored the situational conditions and inferred tendencies typical for the Kenyan context.

7.2. Consequences for the teaching and learning of German as a foreign language in Kenya

After establishing the nature and status of the multilingual language learning awareness of Kenyan learners of German, this study’s findings guide in the identification of where there is need for intervention, and what kind of intervention is needed in the learning of German as a foreign language in Kenyan secondary schools. This section adds to the identified points and suggestions in chapters 4 and 6.

As pointed out at the introduction, multilingual language learning awareness is a skill to be taught and learned; and this is needed in the Kenyan schools to

counter the rejection and suppression of Kiswahili's agency in the German language learning process. Even though the majority of the learners feel that Kiswahili plays no role in their learning of German as a foreign language, the fact that they (the learners) are not able to identify Kiswahili as the source of some of the errors they make in the German language shows that it does indeed have an effect, in line with postulations that all the languages present in a multilingual's system are involved in the process of learning a new language (Herdina & Jessner, 2002). While the errors might make it to the German language via the English language -which the learners give as the base language. (what the study referred to as multileveled cross-linguistic influence)-, the fact remains that Kiswahili is the original source, and the errors are fossilized in the English language. The learners must therefore be sensitized to this reality. Additionally, the proficiency of the learners' preferred bridge language (English) must be looked into, regardless of their self-evaluation (See 6.12.5) even as the teaching of German as a foreign language is built upon the learners' knowledge of English.

The fact that Kenyan learners have already had 8 years of learning English and Kiswahili language at the onset of learning German does not automatically mean that they are conversant with all grammatical categories and terminologies they encounter in the German language. As the discussion in 6.12.2 shows, there are learners who at the end of their third year of learning German still refer to "es" (a pronoun) as an article, or "eine" (an indefinite article) as a verb. This points to the need to expound on the grammatical categories and terminology so as to ensure that all learners are on board.

The centrality of explicit grammar in the learning of German as a foreign language among Kenyan learners has been established (chapter 4). However, it is not clear how effective it is in the promotion of communicative skills in the German language, seeing that there is more to a language than the grammar taught in the classroom (see Butzkamm, 2002, p. 245). This is especially relevant given that learners admit that their concentration on grammatical rules inhibit their language use in the case of free conversations (4.2.2.2). The fact that learners feel that focusing on rules and structures hampers their attempts to use

German in conversations points to a need to rethink the Kenyan schools' apparent overemphasis on German grammar.

Dictionary use is a skill that needs to be taught to the learners. This was already pointed out in the discussion on the learners' understanding of "direct translation" (6.12.1). A case in point is in the use of "ungefähr" by PG5 and PG8 in their attempt to correct the error in the item "Es möchte regnen" (Item 6.10); it is evident that the learners checked for the equivalence of "about" "it is about to rain", and then picked on "ungefähr" from the listed equivalences. Effective dictionary use is especially important for the learners in Kenyan secondary schools (especially the boarding type), seeing that there are few available resources, hence the reliance on the German-English dictionaries. It is therefore not surprising that 3 learners referred to dictionary use in response to the question how best they learn German.[121] These comments by the learners show that they need empowering in proper and optimal dictionary use.

Teachers of German as a foreign language must be involved in the development of the multilingual language learning awareness. This is in the light of the evident learners' dependence on their (the teachers') input as highlighted in 4.3.1., as well as their probable influence on the learners' conceptualization of linguistic and grammatical phenomena observed in 6.9 and 6.10. This is especially important, seeing that the curriculum of the major teacher training university does not contain a single course module that focuses on multilingualism in the learning of German as a foreign language,[122] which therefore leads to the careful conclusion that the teachers are not well equipped to optimise the multilinguality of their learners into a resource from which the learning process would benefit. This calls for the involvement of the stakeholders involved in the development of the curriculum, the teacher trainers, as well as other supporting institutions like the Goethe-Institut to empower the teachers in this respect.

---

[121] MB6: *[…]going through my German dictionary every once in a while.*
SB1: *I best learn german from my teacher who gives me 70% of the content. The remaining 30% I gain from reading the German dictionary […]*
KG9: *I learn German by looking for vocabulary in the dictionary […].*

[122] See discussion in 1.4.3.

7.3. Outlook

This study's investigation into how Kenyan learners perceive their multilinguality in the context of learning German as foreign language provides insights into the state and nature of their multilingual language learning awareness. Building upon its engagement with various theoretical and empirical elements constituting this phenomenon, this study opens up research delving into the following issues, a clearer understanding of which would benefit the learning of languages in multliethnolingual contexts.

The awareness of multilinguality and the resulting cross-linguistic influence investigated in this study is based on the cognitive and partly performance domain of language awareness. The status of the affective, social, power, and domains among Kenyan learners remain undiscovered. The discussion on the Kenyan multilingual setting as the backdrop for learning German as a foreign language (section 1.4) highlighted some of the issues hindering the implementation of healthy multilingualism in education, ranging from failed language policies to the rejection of indigenous languages on account of their unworthiness as well as their negative association with ethnic strife. A look at the newly launched Basic Education Curriculum by the Kenya Institute of Curriculum development (KICD) reveals the intention to use language education to foster Kenya's multiethnolingual diversity (Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development, 2017). At the Upper Primary level (Grade 4, 5, 6), one of the objectives of the subject "Indigenous Languages" is that "[…] the subject will provide the opportunity to nurture acceptance and appreciation for cultural diversity" (p. 37). Further, at the Upper Secondary level (Grades 7,8,9), the subject "Indigenous Languages" aligns itself to the constitutional pledge to "promote and protect the diversity of languages of the people of Kenya" (Chapter 22, Article 7 (3)). Since it has been established that there has always existed a disconnect between policies and practice when it comes to the inclusion of

indigenous Kenyan languages in the school system,[123] it is prudent that a longitudinal study is carried out to establish:

- If and how the KICD's stipulations are implemented;
- how the teachers operationalize these stipulations;
- how receptive the learners are;
- and if the KICD goals and objectives regarding the teaching and learning of indigenous languages are met.

The study focused on the outcome of the learners' processes of reflection on their multilinguaity and learning of German as a foreign language, but not the processes themselves. It therefore falls under retrospective approaches, which do not offer an on-the-task insight into the learners' application of multilingual language learning awareness. This calls for further studies focusing on the processes themselves, e.g. by the use of think-aloud approaches, whose use enables the disclosure –hence access of the cognitive processes the learners engage in in the execution of language tasks (Bowles, 2010). The "self-revelation using think-aloud" reference by Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005, p. 45) illustrates the scope of this approach, as it would allow insight into the dynamics constituting the processes engaged in the application of multilingual language learning awareness, thereby enabling the identification of deficiencies that would be attended to so as to improve efficiency.

While the think-aloud approaches would give insight to the learners' mental processes, ethnographic approaches like classroom observation would allow for the investigation of the learners' application of the multilingual language learning awareness during the lesson. This would enable the examination of the learners' use of skills associated with this awareness not only in the execution of language tasks, but also in their interactions and participation in the classroom. Such an investigation would build upon the studies on translanguaging in the Kenyan multilingual classrooms (Mwaniki, 2016), going beyond the application

[123] See 1.4.2, also for a comment on this disconnect by an official of the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development

of the various languages present in the classrooms to investigating the learners' awareness of the language nuances that govern classroom practices.

Going by the design and development of the course books used in the teaching of German in Kenyan schools (Kenya Institute of Education, 2009a, 2009b, 2011), the centrality of explicit grammatical knowledge as well as knowledge of grammatical terminology was key in the conceptualisation of this study. However, the question of how much of this grammatical knowledge is required for Kenyan learners of German to successfully bridge the interlingual gap has not been answered. This calls for an evaluation of the explicit grammatical knowledge Kenyan learners of German bring with them at the onset of learning German as a foreign language. Such an evaluation would inform the teachers on the gaps that still exist, and provide a better-informed approach beyond the assumption that the learners "(should) know it since they have been learning languages for the last nine years".

The analysis of the data from the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test touches on the question of explicit-implicit knowledge interface. It draws from the learners' reflection of their German language learning behaviour as well as their engagement with the test items to add to the argument for a strong interface position. The position is further reinforced by the learners' tendency to reduce the German language to its grammar and base their performance on their mastery of grammar (See discussion in 4.4.). However, since proving this hypothesis fell outside the direct scope of this study, the postulation that the Kenyan learners' implicit knowledge of German builds upon their explicit grammatical knowledge, however, remains unproven.

This investigation was restricted to multilingual language learning awareness in the context of learning German as a foreign language. Similar studies could be carried out to establish the status in the contexts of learning of other languages, since multilingual language learning awareness seeks wholistic and holistic development of the multilingual's system. From the findings of this study, it appears that the explicit grammatical and linguistic knowledge of Kiswahili and English are still not very well developed (the learners feel that learning German

helps develop their explicit grammatical knowledge of English, as discussed in 4.1.5.1., 4.1.5.2.) regardless of the fact that the learners have been learning them since their first year in school. This calls for investigations into the didactic approaches and their effectiveness into the teaching of language in Kenyan schools.

Metalinguistic knowledge and awareness has been discussed as an important aspect of language awareness, as it encompasses the analysis of linguistic knowledge and control of linguistic processing (Bialystok, 1979, 1986, 1987, 1991, 1994). These skills would enable a learner to be more perceptive in their engagement with language and its learning. An examination of the teaching of language(s) in Kenyan schools would establish whether and in what ways metalinguistic knowledge and awareness is taken into account, either as a didactic tool or a goal. This is especially important in the context of the findings that teaching of English and Kiswahili in Kenyan schools takes transmission forms (Kembo-Sure, 2013, p. 50)[124] and going by the fact that learning of foreign languages is built upon this foundation.

This study limited itself to analysed explicit grammatical knowledge and grammatical terminology in its operationalization of metalinguistic knowledge and awareness. This, however, is not exhaustive of what metalinguistic knowledge and awareness entails. A follow-up study could delve into the attributes and state of metalinguistic knowledge of Kenyan learners, observing its development as the learners progress in their schooling. Variables like age, level of education, aptitude, academic ability (measured by performance in other school subjects), gender etc. would be used to develop a more differentiated approach, hence a better understanding of metalinguistic abilities of learners growing up in dynamic multiethnolingual contexts like the Kenyan one.

Going by the instances of the learners' colloquial language use in the formal written test (6.2.4), the question of multilingual language learning awareness as a social process arises. This calls for an investigation into the cognitive development of the learners' perception of and sensitivity to the different social

[124] Discussed in details in 1.4.2.

registers and their ability to navigate the different scenarios that demand differentiation. This would involve going beyond the Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)(Cummins, 2008), to looking into their ability to embrace the fluidity that participation in various discourses calls for.

The study establishes that the Kenyan learners of German use translation as a learning method and strategy (4.1.1.2.). The question, however, is whether the learners are able to use this method effectively, especially looking at their execution of the tasks in the Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test, whereby "direct translation" was the default explanation of the error for most of the learners. This calls for an investigation into the development of this translation as a language learning method in Kenyan schools.

7.4. Conclusion

If multilingualism is to be used as a resource in the learning of new and foreign languages, then the question of how to go about it begs to be answered. This dissertation approached this question from the argument that knowing and understanding one's multilinguality would be a step closer to engaging it better in the learning process. Like everything else, a resource would be useless if it is not acknowledged as such and put to appropriate use. This study makes it evident is that knowledge of multiple languages does not automatically translate into more resources in foreign language learning, especially if these languages are classified into high and low varieties. While the use of these low variety languages tends to be more widespread in the learners' sociolinguistic spaces, the learners do not regard them as highly as they do the high variety languages. This prejudice means that learners resist the mastery of these low varieties even as they strive for excellence in high varieties, which in turn shapes the learners' multilingual systems. This means that the foreign language didactical approaches that build upon the learners' existing knowledge of and about languages must be rethought.

Fluidity across various languages is an expected and accepted practice in multilingual communities, hence the calls to approach multilingualism "from below" (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015, pp. 9–14) using the lens of languanging, polylanguaging, translanguaging, super-/hyper-diversity, metrolingualism etc. Institutional language teaching and learning, on the other hand, still adheres to a "target language", whose norms and regulations define it as a distinct entity, even when there are similarities and parallels with other languages. The curricula, course books, grammar lessons, language tests, etc. prescribe and regulate the teaching and learning of these target languages by defining demarcations between them and other languages. So long as this is the upheld view of language didactics, then the question of the learners' awareness of the discrepancies between the everyday linguistic practices and the streamlines of school language learning remains relevant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agoya-Wotsuna, C. N. (2012). Die Sprachsituation Kenias als Voraussetzung für die Vermittlung des Deutschen als Fremdsprache. Münster: Waxmann.

Alderson, J. C., Clapham, C., & Steel, D. (1997). Metalinguistic knowledge, language aptitude and language proficiency. In *Language Teaching Research*, *1*(2), 93–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216889700100202

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. In *ELT Journal*, *56*(1), 57–64. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.57

Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. In *Language Awareness*, *12*(2), 81–95.

Archibald, M. M. (2016). Investigator Triangulation: A Collaborative Strategy With Potential for Mixed Methods Research. In *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *10*(3), 228–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815570092

Aronin, L., & Hufeisen, B. (Eds.). (2009a). The exploration of multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. M. (2012). Multilingualism. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Ashton, E. O. (1977). Swahili grammar: (Including intonation) (2. ed., this impr., 3. impr). London: Longman.

Bassett, R., Beagan, B. L., Ristovski-Slijepcevic, S., & Chapman, G. E. (2008). Tough teens: The methodological challenges of interviewing teenagers as research participants. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.

Beedham, C. (1995). German linguistics: An introduction. München: Iudicium.

Berman, R. A. (1979). Rule of grammar or rule of thumb? In *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *17* (1–4), 279–302.

Bialystok, E. (1979). Explicit and Implicit Judgements of L2 Grammaticality. *Language Learning*, *29*(1), 81–103. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1979.tb01053.x

Bialystok, E. (1986). Factors in the Growth of Linguistic Awareness. In *Child Development*, *57*(2), 498. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130604

Bialystok, E. (1987). Influences of bilingualism on metalinguistic development. In *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin (Utrecht)*, *3*(2), 154–166.

Bialystok, E. (Ed.). (1991). Language processing in bilingual children. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bialystok, E. (1994). Analysis and Control in the Development of Second Language Proficiency. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*(02), 157. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100012857

Bono, M. (2011). Crosslinguistic interaction and metalinguistic awareness in third language acquisition. In *New Trends in Crosslinguistic Influence and Multilingualism Research*, *60*, 25.

Bouvy, C. (2000). Towards the construction of a theory of cross-linguistic transfer. In *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*, *19*, 143.

Bowles, M. A. (2010). The think-aloud controversy in second language research. New York: Routledge.

Brown, J. D. (2009). Open-Response Items in Questionnaires. In J. Heigham & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 200–219). https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230239517_10

Buregeya, A. (2006). Grammatical features of Kenyan English and the extent of their acceptability. In *English World-Wide*, *27*(2), 199–216. https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.27.2.05bur

Butzkamm, W. (2002). Psycholinguistik des Fremdsprachenunterrichts: Von der Muttersprache zur Fremdsprache (3., neubearbeitete Auflage). Tübingen Basel: A. Francke Verlag.

Carr, N. S. (2013). Increasing the Effectiveness of Homework for All Learners in the Inclusive Classroom. In *School Community Journal*, *23*(1), 169–182.

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). Cambridge grammar of English: A comprehensive guide: spoken and written English grammar and usage. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cenoz, J. (2001). The effect of linguistic distance, L2 status and age on cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. In *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, *111*(45), 8–20.

Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining Multilingualism. In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *33*, 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051300007X

Cenoz, J., & Genesee, F. (1998). Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=16680

Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (Eds.). (2001). Cross-linguistic influence in third language aquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives. Clevedon, UK ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J., May, S., & Durk, G. (Eds.). (2017). Language awareness and multilingualism (3rd edition). New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Chandrasekhar, A. (1978). Base Language. In *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *16*(1), 62–5.

Cheung, A. S. C., Stephen, M., & Tsang, W. L. (2011). Transfer from L3 German to L2 English in the domain of tense/aspect. In *New Trends in Crosslinguistic Influence and Multilingualism Research*, 53–73.

Chraudron, C. (1983). Research On Metalinguistic Judgments: A Review Of Theory, Methods, And Results. In *Language Learning*, *33*(3), 343–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1983.tb00546.x

Cohen, A. D. (1987). Using verbal reports in research on language learning. In *Multilingual Matters, No. 30. Introspection in second language research.* (pp. 82–95). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). Strategies in learning and using a second language. London ; New York: Longman.

Cook, V. (2003). Effects of the second language on the first (Vol. 3). Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. J. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multicompetence. In *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin (Utrecht)*, *7*(2), 103–117.

Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. In *Language Learning*, *42*(4), 557–591.

Cook, V., & Li, W. (Eds.). (2016). The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, H., Robinson, J. C., & Patall, E. A. (2006). Does Homework Improve Academic Achievement? A Synthesis of Research, 1987–2003. In *Review of Educational Research*, *76*(1), 1–62. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076001001

Corder, S. P. (1975). Error analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition. In *Language Teaching*, *8*(04), 201–218.

Crinion, J. (2006). Language Control in the Bilingual Brain. In *Science*, *312*(5779), 1537–1540. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1127761

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first-and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. In *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*, 70–89.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 487–499). Springer.

Dahlhaus, B. (2007). Fertigkeit Hören (Nachdr.). Berlin: Langenscheidt.

Davies, N. F. (1976). Receptive Versus Productive Skills in Foreign Language Learning. In *The Modern Language Journal*, *60*(8), 440–443. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1976.tb03667.x

De Angelis, G. (2007). Third or additional language acquisition. Clevedon ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

De Angelis, G., & Dewaele, J.-M. (Eds.). (2011). New trends in crosslinguistic influence and multilingualism research. Bristol ; Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A Dynamic Systems Theory approach to second language acquisition. In *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*(01), 7. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002732

De Bot, K., Verspoor, M., & Lowie, W. (2005). Dynamic Systems Theory and Applied Linguistics: The ultimate "so what"? In *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(1), 116–118.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, 42–63.

Dodd, B. (Ed.). (2004). Modern German grammar: A practical guide (2nd ed). London ; New York: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign foreign language learning. In *Language Teaching*, *31*(03), 117–135. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480001315X

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies. Oxford ; New York, N.Y: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The psychology of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing (2nd ed). New York ; London: Routledge.

Dostert, L. E. (1955). Foreign-language reading skill. In *Journal of Chemical Education*, *32*(3), 128. https://doi.org/10.1021/ed032p128

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2009). Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (Nachdr.). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Dreyer, H., & Schmitt, R. (Eds.). (2008). A practice grammar of German (New ed., 1. Aufl., 5. Dr). Ismaning: Hueber.

Duflo, E., Dupas, P., & Kremer, M. (2011). Peer Effects, Teacher Incentives, and the Impact of Tracking: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Kenya. In *American Economic Review*, *101*(5), 1739–1774. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.5.1739

Durrell, M., & Hammer, A. E. (2002). Hammer's German grammar and usage (4th ed). London: Hodder.

Eckhard-Black, C., & Whittle, R. (1992). German: A handbook of grammar, current usage and word power. London: Cassell.

Ellis, N. C. (1993). Rules and instances in foreign language learning: Interactions of explicit and implicit knowledge. In *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *5*(3), 289–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/09541449308520120

Ellis, N. C. (Ed.). (1994). Implicit and explicit learning of languages. London ; San Diego: Academic Press.

Ellis, N. C. (1996). Sequencing in SLA: Phonological memory, chunking, and points of order. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*(1), 91–126.

Ellis, N. C. (1998). Emergentism, connectionism and language learning. *Language Learning*, *48*(4), 631–664.

Ellis, N. C. (2008). Implicit and explicit knowledge about language. In J. Cenoz & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 6, pp. 119–131). Springer.

Ellis, N. C. (2015). Implicit and explicit language learning: Their dynamic interface and complexity. In P. Rebuschat (Ed.) *Studies in Bilingualism* (Vol. 48, pp. 1–24). https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.48.01ell

Ellis, R. (1991). Grammaticality Judgments and Second Language Acquisition. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *13*(02), 161–186. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009931

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford University.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating Form-Focused Instruction. In *Language Learning*, *51*, 1–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00013.x

Ellis, R. (2004). The Definition and Measurement of L2 Explicit Knowledge. In *Language Learning*, *54*(2), 227–275. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00255.x

Ellis, R. (2005a). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*(2), 141–172.

Ellis, R. (2005b). Principles of instructed language learning. In *System*, *33*(2), 209–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006

Ellis, R. (2015). Form-focused instruction and the measurement of implicit and explicit L2 knowledge. In P. Rebuschat (Ed.), In *Studies in Bilingualism* (Vol. 48, pp. 417–442). https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.48.17ell

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. P. (2005). Analysing learner language. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Loewen, S. (2007). Confirming the Operational Definitions of Explicit and Implicit Knowledge in Ellis (2005): Responding to Isemonger. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *29*(01). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107070052

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J., & Reinders, H. (Eds.). (2009). Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching. Bristol, UK ; Buffalo [N.Y.]: Multilingual Matters.

Fairclough, N. (2014). Critical language awareness. Routledge.

Flick, U. (Ed.). (1991). Handbuch qualitative Sozialforschung: Grundlagen, Konzepte, Methoden und Anwendungen. München: Psychologie-Verl.-Union.

Flick, U. (Ed.). (2014). The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Franceschini, R. (2009). The genesis and development of research in multilingualism. In *The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of Research on L*, *3*, 27–61.

Gallmann, P., Sitta, H., Geipel, M., & Wagner, A. (Eds.). (2013). Schülerduden Grammatik: Die Schulgrammatik zum Lernen, Nachschlagen und Üben ; [mit Übungen und Lösungen!] (7., neu bearb. und aktualis. Aufl). Berlin: Dudenverl.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (Eds.). (1994). Language transfer in language learning (rev. ed., reprinted with corr). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gennaro, R. J. (1996). Consciousness and self-consciousness: A defense of the higher-order thought theory of consciousness. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gombert, J. E. (1992). Metalinguistic development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grabe, W. (2006). Areas of research that influence L2 reading instruction. In *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills*, *29*(29), 279–301.

Green, P. S., & Hecht, K. (1992). Implicit and Explicit Grammar:An Empirical Study. In *Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 168–184. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/13.2.168

Grosjean, F. (1985). The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *6*(6), 467–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1985.9994221

Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. In *Brain and Language*, *36*(1), 3–15.

Gutiérrez, X. (2013). The Construct Validity of Grammaticality Judgment Tests as Measures of Implicit and Explicit Knowledge. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *35*(03), 423–449. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263113000041

Habermann, M., Diewald, G., & Thurmair, M. (2012). Duden—Fit für das Bachelorstudium, Grundwissen Grammatik (Nachdr). Mannheim: Dudenverl.

Han, Y., & Ellis, R. (1998). Implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge and general language proficiency. In *Language Teaching Research*, *2*(1), 1–23.

Harbert, W. (2006). The Germanic Languages. Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, E. W. (1984). Awareness of language: An introduction. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, E. W. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. In *Language Awareness*, *8*(3–4), 124–142.

Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics. Clevedon, England Buffalo, N.Y: Multilingual Matters.

Hinga, A. N. (2015). Transfer of English competence into the written German of Kenyan form four learners: The case of negative transfer (Thesis, University of Nairobi). Retrieved from http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/11295/93952

Hofer, B. (2015). On the Dynamics of Early Multilingualism: A Psycholinguistic Study. Retrieved from https://books.google.de/books?id=-xvYoQEACAAJ

Hoffmann, C., & Ytsma, J. (Eds.). (2004). Trilingualism in family, school, and community. Clevedon [Eng.] ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Höftmann, H., & Herms, I. (2000). Langenscheidts Handwörterbuch Swahili-Deutsch (Neubearbeitung). Berlin: Langenscheidt.

Hong, E., Milgram, R. M., & Rowell, L. L. (2004). Homework Motivation and Preference: A Learner-Centered Homework Approach. In *Theory Into Practice*, *43*(3), 197–204. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4303_5

Hufeisen, B. (1994). Englisch im Unterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache (1. Aufl., [1. Dr.]). München: Klett.

Hufeisen, B. (2000). A European perspective–Tertiary languages with a focus on German as L3. In *Handbook of Undergraduate Second Language Education*, 209–229.

Hufeisen, B. (2003). L1, L2, L3, L4, Lx-alle gleich? Linguistische, lernerinterne und lernerexterne Faktoren in Modellen zum multiplen Spracherwerb. In *Zeitschrift Für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, *8*(2).

Hufeisen, B., & Lindemann, B. (Eds.). (1998). Tertiärsprachen: Theorien, Modelle, Methoden. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Hufeisen, B., & Marx, N. (Eds.). (2007). EuroComGerm - die sieben Siebe: Germanische Sprachen lesen lernen: Deutsch und Englisch, Dansk, Fries, Íslenska, Nederlands, Norsk (Bokmål/Nynorsk), Svenska. Aachen: Shaker.

Hufeisen, B., Neuner, G., & Europarat (Eds.). (2004). The Plurilingualism Project: Tertiary Language Learning - German after English. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Hufeisen, B., Neuner, G., & Europarat (Eds.). (2005). Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept: Tertiärsprachenlernen ; Deutsch nach Englisch (2. Dr., korrigierte Aufl). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2005). Theoretical and Empirical Issues in the Study of Implicit and Explicit Second-Language Learning: Introduction. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*(02). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050084

Hulstijn, J. H. (2007). Psycholinguistic perspectives on language and its acquisition. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 783–795). Springer.

Imo, W. (2016). Grammatik: Eine Einführung. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler Verlag.

Isemonger, I. M. (2007). Operational definitions of explicit and implicit knowledge: Response to R. Ellis (2005) and Some Recommendations for Future Research in This Area. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *29*(01). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107070040

James, C. (1996). A cross-linguistic approach to language awareness. In *Language Awareness*, *5*(3–4), 138–148.

James, C., & Garrett, P. (Eds.). (1992). Language awareness in the classroom. London ; New York: Longman.

Jessner, U. (2006). Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals: English as a Third Language: English as a Third Language. Edinburgh University Press.

Jessner, U. (2008). A DST Model of Multilingualism and the Role of Metalinguistic Awareness. In *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(2), 270–283. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00718.x

Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylanguaging in Superdiversity. In *Diversities*, *13*(2).

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2010). Vernacularization, globalization, and language economics in non-English-speaking countries in Africa. In *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *34*(1), 1–23.

Kanyoro, M. R. (1991). The politics of the English language in Kenya and Tanzania. In *English around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 402–419.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1979). Micro- and macrodevelopmental changes in language acquisition and other representational systems. In *Cognitive Science*, *3*(2), 91–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213(79)80027-0

Karmiloff-Smith, A., Grant, J., Sims, K., Jones, M.-C., & Cuckle, P. (1996). Rethinking metalinguistic awareness: Representing and accessing knowledge about what counts as a word. In *Cognition*, *58*(2), 197–219.

Kellerman, E. (2001). New uses for old language: Cross-linguistic and cross-gestural influence in the narratives of non-native speakers. In *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, 170–191.

Kellerman, E., & Sharwood Smith, M. (Eds.). (1986). Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition (1st ed). New York: Pergamon Institute of English.

Kembo-Sure. (2013). Inaugural lecture: Literacy, language, and liberty: the cultural politics of English as official language in Africa. Eldoret, Kenya: Moi University Press.

Kembo-Sure, & Ogechi, N. O. (2006). Language planning and reform: An alternative language policy for Kenya. In E. Kembo-Sure & N. O. Ogechi (Eds.), In *Language planning for development in Africa*. Eldoret: Moi University Press.

Kenya Institute of Education. (2009a). Safari Deutsch Band I (1st ed.). Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya Institute of Education. (2009b). Safari Deutsch Band II (1st ed.). Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya Institute of Education. (2011). Safari Deutsch Band III (1st ed.). Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kindiki, J. N. (2009). Effectiveness of communication on students discipline in secondary schools in Kenya. In *Educational Research and Reviews*, *4*(5), 252–259.

Kiprop, C. J. (2012). Approaches to management of discipline in secondary schools in Kenya. In *International Journal of Research in Management*, *2*(1), 120–139.

Kleppin, K. (1997). Fehler und Fehlerkorrektur (Nachdr.). Berlin: Langenscheidt.

Kohn, A. (2006a). Down with Homework. In *Instructor*, *116*(2), 43.

Kohn, A. (2006b). The homework myth: Why our kids get too much of a bad thing. Da Capo Lifelong Books.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning (Reprinted). Oxford: Pergamon Pr.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/complexity science and second language acquisition. In *Applied Linguistics*, *18*(2), 141–165.

Little, D. (2007). Language Learner Autonomy: Some Fundamental Considerations Revisited. In *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *1*(1), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.2167/illt040.0

Long, M. H. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of A. Ronald Walton*, 179–192.

Mackatiani, C. I. (2017). Influence of Examinations Oriented Approaches on Quality Education in Primary Schools in Kenya. In *Journal of Education and Practice*, *8*(14), 51–58.

Martin, J.-P. (2000). Lernen durch Lehren: Ein modernes Unterrichtskonzept. In *Schulverwaltung Bayern: Link Verlag*, 1–13.

Marx, N., & Hufeisen, B. (2003). » Multilingualism: Theory, Research Methods and Didactics «. In *New Visions in Foreign and Second Language Education*, 178.

Marx, N., & Hufeisen, B. (2007). How can DaFnE and EuroComGerm contribute to the concept of receptive multilingualism. In *Receptive Multilingualism. Linguistic Analyses, Language Policies and Didactic Concepts*, 307–321.

Marx, N., & Hufeisen, B. (2010). Mehrsprachigkeitskonzepte. In H.-J. Krumm, C. Fandrych, B. Hufeisen, & C. Riemer (Eds.), In *Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache: Ein Internationales Handbuch* (pp. 826–832). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why Triangulate? In *Educational Researcher*, *17*(2), 13–17. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X017002013

Mayring, P. (2010). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. In G. Mey & K. Mruck (Eds.), *Handbuch Qualitative Forschung in der Psychologie* (pp. 601–613). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92052-8_42

Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative Content Analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. Klagenfurt.

Mbithi, E. K. (2014). Multilingualism, language policy and creative writing in Kenya. In *Multilingual Education*, *4*(1), 19.

McKay, S. L. (2009). Introspective techniques. In *Qualitative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 220–241). Springer.

Mendoza-Denton, N., & Osborne, D. (2010). Two languages, two identities. In *Language and Identities*, 113–122.

Michieka, M. M. (2005). English in Kenya: A sociolinguistic profile. In *World Englishes*, *24*(2), 173–186.

Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. In *Psychological Review*, *63*(2), 81.

Mkilifi, M. A. (1972). Triglossia and Swahili-English bilingualism in Tanzania1. *Language in Society*, *1*(2), 197–213.

Mohamed, M. A. (2001). Modern Swahili grammar. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.

Muaka, L. (2011). Language Perceptions and Identity among Kenyan Speakers. In *Selected Proceeding of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 217–230. Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA.

Muchira, R. (2018). Der Deutschunterricht als Sprachenuntericht: Zur Förfderung linguistischer Kompetenzen kenianischer Deutschlernenden. In S. Mayanja, L. Mauritz, & M. Ikobwa (Eds.), *>>Das Zentrum bewegt sich<< Aufsätze zur (ost) afrikanischen Germanistik* (pp. 125–136). Berlin: Weidler Buchverlag.

Muli, F. (2017, September 25). President Uhuru's son who can't speak Swahili—Business Today Kenya. *Business Today*. Retrieved from https://businesstoday.co.ke/muhoho-kenyatta-roasted-poor-swahili-mastery

Müller, H. M. (2009). Arbeitsbuch Linguistik: Eine Einführung in die Sprachwissenschaft (2., überarbeitete und aktualisierte Auflage). Paderborn München Wien Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh.

Mwaniki, M. (2016). Translanguaging as a class/lecture-room language management strategy in multilingual contexts: Insights from autoethnographic snapshots from Kenya and South Africa. In *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *34*(3), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2016.1250357

Myles, F., Hooper, J., & Mitchell, R. (1998). Rote or rule? Exploring the role of formulaic language in classroom foreignlanguage learning. In *Language Learning*, *48*(3), 323–364.

Myles, F., Mitchell, R., & Hooper, J. (1999). Interrogative chunks in French L2: A basis for creative construction? In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *21*(1), 49–80.

Nabea, W. (2009). Language Policy in Kenya: Negotiation with Hegemony. In *Journal of Pan African Studies*, *3*(1).

Nelson, G., & Greenbaum, S. (2016). An introduction to English grammar (Fourth Edition). London ; New York: Routledge.

Neuner, G. (2010). Developing Synergies in Learning Foreign Languages–implications for the plurilingual curriculum. Prieiga internete: www. coe. int/T/DG4/Linguistic/Source/NEUNER-Amsterdam. doc Peržiūrėta.

Neuner, Gerhard. (1999). „Deutsch nach Englisch ". Übungen und Aufgaben für den Anfangsunterricht. In *Fremdsprache Deutsch*, *20*, 15–21.

Neuner, Gerhard. (2009). Mehrsprachigkeitsdidaktik und Tertiärsprachenlernen Grundlagen-Dimensionen-Merkmale Zur Konzeption des Lehrwerks „deutsch. Com “.

Njoroge, M. C., & Gatambuki Gathigia, M. (2017). The treatment of Indigenous Languages in Kenya's Pre- and Post-independent Education Commissions and in the Constitution of 2010. In *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(6), 76. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.6p.76

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. In *Language Learning*, *50*(3), 417–528.

Odlin, T. (1989). Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge University Press

Odlin, T. (2003). Cross-Linguistic Influence. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 436–486). https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch15

Oduor, J. A. (2010). A SWOT analysis of the language policies in education in Kenya and Ethiopia. In *The University of Nairobi Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *1*.

Oduor, J. A. (2015). Towards a practical proposal for multilingualism in education in Kenya. In *Multilingual Education*, *5*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13616-014-0015-0

Okombo, D. O. (2015, June 2). 'My names are...' and other crimes. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved from https://www.nation.co.ke/lifestyle/artculture/wrong-use-of-English-phrases-in-Kenya/1954194-2615354-f6fqjjz/index.html

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening Comprehension Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. In *Applied Linguistics*, *10*(4), 418–437. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/10.4.418

Ouedraogo, R. M. (2002). The use of African languages in educational systems in Africa. In *Newsletter*, *4*(4).

Oxford, R. L. (2006). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know (Nachdr.). Boston, Mass: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language Learning Motivation: Expanding the Theoretical Framework. In *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(1), 12–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02011.x

Oyango, O. (2011). I'm African... Not African American (p. 19). Retrieved from University of Puget Sound website: http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/writing_awards/19

Paradis, M. (1990). Language lateralization in bilinguals: Enough already! In *Brain and Language*, *39*(4), 576–586. https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(90)90163-B

Paradis, M. (1994). Neurolinguistic Aspects of Implicit and Explicit Memory: Implications for Bilingualism and SLA. In Ellis N.C. (Ed.), *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages* (pp. 393–419). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Pavlenko, A., & Scott, J. (2002). Bidirectional Transfer. In *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(2), 190–214. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.2.190

Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). Metrolingualism: Language in the city. London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Pratt, D. D. (2002). Good Teaching: One Size Fits All? In *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, *2002*(93), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.45

Ringbom, H. (2001). Lexical transfer in L3 production. In *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, 59–68.

Roberts, A. D. (2011). The role of metalinguistic awareness in the effective teaching of foreign languages. Oxford ; New York: Peter Lang.

Roehr, K., & Gánem-Gutiérrez, G. A. (2015). The metalinguistic dimension in instructed second language learning. New York: Bloomsbury Academic

Roehr-Brackin, K. (2018). Metalinguistic awareness and second language acquisition. New York: Routledge.

Rosenthal, J. W. (2000). Handbook of undergraduate second language education. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=44932

Rost, M. (2006). Areas of research that influence L2 listening instruction. In *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills*, *29*(29), 47–73.

Rutherford, W., & Smith, M. S. (1985). Consciousness-raising and Universal Grammar. In *Applied Linguistics*, *6*(3), 274–282. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.3.274

Schmalz, X., Marinus, E., Coltheart, M., & Castles, A. (2015). Getting to the bottom of orthographic depth. In *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *22*(6), 1614–1629. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0835-2

Schmidt, C. (2010). Sprachbewusstheit und Sprachlernbewusstheit. In H. J. Krumm, F. Fandrych, B. Hufeisen, & C. Riemer (Eds.), *Deutsch als Fremd-und Zweitsprache. Ein internationales Handbuch* (Vol. 1, pp. 858–866). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schmied, J. (2008). East African Englishes. In *The Handbook of World Englishes*, *28*, 188–202.

Schütze, C. T. (1996). The empirical base of linguistics: Grammaticality judgments and linguistic methodology. Chicago, Il: University of Chicago Press.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. In *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *10*(1–4), 209–232.

Sharwood-Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-Raising and the Second Language Learner. In *Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 159–168.

Sharwood-Smith, M. (1989). Crosslinguistic influence in language loss. In *Bilingualism across the Lifespan: Aspects of Acquisition, Maturity and Loss*, 185.

Siebenhaar, B., & Voegeli, W. (1997). Mundart und Hochdeutsch im Vergleich. In *Mundart Und Hochdeutsch Im Unterricht. Orientierungshilfen Für Lehrer*, 75–87.

Simpson, A. (Ed.). (2008). Language and national identity in Africa. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Svalberg, A. M. (2007). Language awareness and language learning. In *Language Teaching*, *40*(4), 287–308.

Taylor, D. S. (1988). The meaning and use of the term 'competence'in linguistics and applied linguistics. In *Applied Linguistics*, *9*(2), 148–168.

Tellier, A. (2013). Developing a measure of metalinguistic awareness for children aged 8-11. In *The Metalinguistic Dimension in Instructed Second Language Learning*, 15–43.

The Constitution of Kenya. (2010). Nairobi: National Council for Law Reporting.

Thije, J. D. ten, & Zeevaert, L. (Eds.). (2007). Receptive multilingualism: Linguistic analyses, language policies, and didactic concepts. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Trévise, A. (1996). Contrastive metalinguistic representations: The case of 'very French'learners of English. In *Language Awareness*, *5*(3–4), 188–195.

Tunmer, W. E., Pratt, C., & Herriman, M. L. (1984). Metalinguistic Awareness in Children Theory, Research, and Implications. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69113-3

Vafaee, P., Suzuki, Y., & Kachisnke, I. (2017). Validating Grammaticality Judgment Tests. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *39*(01), 59–95. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263115000455

Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. In *Language Teaching*, *40*(03), 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004338

Vatterott, C. (2010). Five hallmarks of good homework. In *Educational Leadership*, *68*(1), 10–15.

Wa Thiong'o, N. (1986). Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature (Reprint). Oxford: Currey [u.a.].

Wairungu, M. G. (2014). 'A Language of Many Hats': The Rise of Sheng and other Linguistic Styles among Urban Youth in Kenya (Thesis). Charlottesville, Virginia.

Wandruszka, M. (1979). Die Mehrsprachigkeit des Menschen. München ; Zürich: Piper.

Weskamp, R. (2007). Mehrsprachigkeit: Sprachevolution, kognitive Sprachverarbeitung und schulischer Fremdsprachenunterricht. Braunschweig: Schroedel.

Westhoff, G. (2001). Fertigkeit Lesen (3. Dr). Berlin: Langenscheidt.

Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Language switches in L3 production: Implications for a polyglot speaking model. In *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 295–333.

Wrembel, M. (2013). Metalinguistic awarenss in third language phonological acquisition. In *The Metalinguistic dimension in instructed second language learning* (pp. 119–143).

Zawawi, S. (1995). Kiswahili Kwa Kitendo: Learn our Kiswahili. Vol.I: An introductory course (3rd print). Trenton: Afric. World Press.

INTERNET SOURCES

About Association for Language Awareness. (2019, January). Retrieved from http://www.languageawareness.org/?page_id=48

Buregeya, A. (2013). Kenyan English. In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (Eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Retrieved from http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/46

Courses for children and young people - Goethe-Institut Kenia. (2018, December 4). Retrieved 4 December 2018, from https://www.goethe.de/ins/ke/en/spr/kur/gia/kuj.html?fbclid=IwAR0k2pna2H1JoaWbD1Ow29a44NUN50Aq0mJxaglWjCcsbmO2DdbSHJ82FRU

Chuo Kikuu cha Dar es Salaam (Ed.). (2001). *TUKI, kamusi ya Kiswahili-Kiingereza =: TUKI, Swahili-English Dictionary* (Toleo la 1). Dar es Salaam: Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili, Chuo Kikuu cha Dar es Salaam.

Kenya. (n.d.). Retrieved 12 February 2018, from https://www.ethnologue.com/country/KE

Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD). (n.d.). Retrieved 8 February 2018, from https://kicd.ac.ke/

Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development. (2017). *Basic Education Curriculum Framework : Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development*. Retrieved from https://kicd.ac.ke/curriculum-reform/basic-education-curriculum-framework

Kenyan Public Schools. (2019, April). Retrieved from opendata.socrata.com/api/views/pvyx-e6iv/rows.pdf

Mayring, P. (2018). *Qualitative Content Analysis // QCAmap*. Retrieved from https://www.qcamap.org

Muli, F. (2017, September 25). President Uhuru's son who can't speak Swahili - Business Today Kenya. *Business Today*. Retrieved from https://businesstoday.co.ke/muhoho-kenyatta-roasted-poor-swahili-mastery

New Dictionary Words | Sep 2017 | Merriam-Webster. (2017, September). Retrieved 22 March 2018, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/new-words-in-the-dictionary-sep-2017

opendata.socrata.com/api/views/pvyx-e6iv/rows.pdf (Retrieved 06.04.1019)

Online Lexicon: Sheng - English. (n.d.). Retrieved 25 October 2018, from https://africanlanguages.com/swahili/sheng/

Professional development in Kenya - Goethe-Institut Kenia. (2018, December 8). Retrieved 4 December 2018, from https://www.goethe.de/ins/ke/en/spr/unt/for/gia.html

Recent updates to the OED. (2018, March 22). Retrieved 22 March 2018, from https://public.oed.com/the-oed-today/recent-updates-to-the-oed/

Standardsprache - Wortbedeutung.info. (2019). Retrieved from https://www.wortbedeutung.info/Standardsprache

Urban Dictionary: Sco Pa Tu Manaa. (2019, August). Retrieved from https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Sco%20Pa%20Tu%20Manaa

Wug-word dictionary definition | wug-word defined. (2018, July 3). Retrieved 7 March 2018, from http://www.yourdictionary.com/wug-word

https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=10217655234518625&id=1412108117

http://mummytales.com/i-lost-my-baby-at-37-weeks-pregnant-this-is-what-happened-june-mbithe-mulis-story/

https://twitter.com/KenyaPower_Care/status/1050713506402721792

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mali_(TV_series)

http://www.imdb.com/title/tt4184438/

APPENDIX 1. THE OPEN QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I: Personal details

First name: _____ Male: _____ Female: _____

Age: _____

School: _____

Section II: Language Background

1. What languages do you speak?
   _____
2. Since when have you learned English and Kiswahili?
   _____
3. How would you gauge your knowledge of English

Speaking	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor
Writing	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor
Reading	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor
Listening	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor
And Kiswahili				
Speaking	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor
Writing	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor
Reading	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor
Listening	(1) very good	(2) good	(3) fair	(4) poor

4. Please mark accordingly.

i) I am conversant with the aspects of Grammar of English and Kiswahili e.g. Parts of Speech and how they relate to each other in sentences
   (YES) (NO) (PARTLY)

ii) I can explain grammatical rules in English
   (YES) (NO) (PARTLY)

iii) I can explain grammatical rules in Kiswahili
   (YES) (NO) (PARTLY)

Section II. Multilingualism in Learning German as a Foreign Language

5. What is your motivation for learning German?
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

6. How best do you learn German? (What methods and strategies do you apply?)
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

7. What do you find **particularly easy** in learning German?

……
……
……
……
……

8. What do you find **particularly difficult** in learning German?
……
……
……
……
……

9. How does your **knowledge of English help you in learning German**? Please explain by giving concrete examples.
……
……
……
……
……
……

10. How does your **knowledge of Kiswahili help you in learning German**? Please explain by giving concrete examples.
……
……
……
……
……
……

11. Has learning German helped **improve your English**? Please explain.
……
……
……
……
……
……

12. Has Learning German helped **improve your Kiswahili**? Please explain.
……
……
……
……
……
……

14. Does learning German **negatively affect your English**? If so, please explain
……
……
……
……

……
……

15. Does learning German **<u>negatively affect your Kiswahili?</u>** If so, please explain

……
……
……
……
……
……
……

16. Does the experience of Learning German motivate you to learn other languages? Please explain

……
……
……
……
……
……

APPENDIX 2: THE UNTIMED GRAMMATICALITY JUDGEMENT TEST

This test contains 20 items. Each of these items contains an error/errors that can be traced to the influence of Kiswahili and English on German. For each of these items, please:

i) Explain why the sentence/phrase is wrong (What rule is being flouted?)

ii) Explain whether the error can be traced back to English or Kiswahili (or both)

iii) Rewrite the sentence correcting the error

1. Wir sind lesen ein Buch.
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

2. Du isst was?
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

3. Wie geht's dir? > ich bin gut!
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

4. Meine Mutter hat Geburtstag. Ich möchte ihr ein Gift kaufen
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

5. >Wie spät ist es?
<Es ist zwei Uhr (0800Uhr)
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

6. Es möchte regnen.
i)……
ii)……
iii)……

7. Er kann spielen Fußball
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..

8. Ich gehe nicht in die Schule, weil ich bin krank.
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..

9. Ich habe eine Katze. Es heißt Mai.
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..

10. Ich bin Mädchen/Ich bin Junge
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..

11. Was ist dein Name?
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..

12. Ich habe Deutsch seit 3 Jahren gelesen
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..
13. Ich bin ein Student in der Sekundarschule
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..

14. >Danke schön!
< Willkommen!
i)……
ii)……..
……
iii)……..

15. Ich möchte Arzt bekommen
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

16. Mein Bruder hat gekocht Ugali.
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

17. Hilf mir mit einer Flasche
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

18. Die Hose ist mehr teuer als die Bluse
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

19. Wir schlafen in Schule
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

20. Ich möchte nach Deutschland fliegen, das ist warum ich lerne Deutsch.
i)……
ii)……
……
iii)……

Selbstständigkeitserklärung und Erklärung über frühere Promotionsversuche

Hiermit versichere ich, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit ohne unzulässige Hilfe Dritter und ohne Benutzung anderer als der angegebenen Hilfsmittel angefertigt habe; die aus fremden Quellen direkt oder indirekt übernommenen Gedanken sind als solche kenntlich gemacht.

Ich habe nicht die Hilfe eines Promotionsberaters/einer Promotionsberaterin in Anspruch genommen. Die Arbeit wurde zuvor weder im Inland noch im Ausland in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form einer anderen Institution vorgelegt. Sie ist weder Bestandteil eines ruhenden Verfahrens noch wurde sie in einem gleichartigen Promotionsverfahren als endgültig nicht bestanden erklärt. Die Arbeit ist vorher auch noch nicht veröffentlicht worden.

Ich erkläre, dass ich bisher noch keine Promotionsversuche unternommen habe.

……..
Ort, Datum

……..
Unterschrift

RACHEL MUCHIRA